

CHURCH HISTORY

SEPTEMBER, 1934

- Chronology and Church-Society Relations in the
Fifteenth Century *George Howard, Jr.*
- The Personality of Luther *Allen G. Cole*
- The Movement of the Age — Its Purpose
and Principles *George H. Shinn*
- Foundations of the Movement for the
Fifteenth Century *Allen G. Cole*
- Modern Interpretation of Lutheranism
by *Allen G. Cole*

Published by
THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORIANS

THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

Founded by Charles Schaff, 1856. Organized in 1881. Incorporated by Act of Congress, March 3, 1875.

OFFICERS FOR 1911

President	Charles Schaff	Secretary	W. M. D. ...
Vice-President	...	Treasurer	...
...
...

OTHER MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

...	...
...	...
...	...
...	...

The *Journal of Church History* is a quarterly journal published in March, June, September, and December by the American Society of Church History. The journal is published for the University of Chicago Press, 527 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Subscription prices for 1911 are: one year, one dollar; and a quarter for each copy. Single copies, 25 cents. The journal is sent to the foreign countries by mail at the rate of one dollar per annum. The American Society of Church History, 527 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill., is the publisher. The journal is published for the University of Chicago Press, 527 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

The *Journal of Church History* is indexed in the *Univ. of Chicago Press*, 527 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

For further information, apply to the American Society of Church History, 527 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. The journal is published for the University of Chicago Press, 527 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

The *Journal of Church History* is published by the University of Chicago Press, 527 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

The *Journal of Church History* is published by the University of Chicago Press, 527 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. The journal is published for the University of Chicago Press, 527 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

CHURCH HISTORY

Edited By J. H. NICHOLS and WILHELM PAUCK
University of Chicago
with the cooperation of

ROLAND BAINTON (*Divinity School,
Yale University*)

R. PIERCE BEAVER (*Missionary Re-
search Library*)

ROBERT GRANT (*Theological Faculty,
University of the South*)

WINTHROP S. HUDSON (*Colgate-
Rochester Divinity School*)

SIDNEY F. MEAD (*Divinity School,
University of Chicago*)

RAY C. PETRY (*Divinity School, Duke
University*)

MATTHEW SPINKA (*Hartford Theo-
logical Seminary*)

L. J. TRINTERUD (*McCormick Theo-
logical Seminary*)

Vol. XX

September, 1951

No. 3

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHRISTOLOGY AND CHURCH-STATE RELATIONS IN THE FOURTH CENTURY

George Huntston Williams 3

THE PERSONALITY OF AMALARIUS

Allen Cabaniss 34

THE MERCERSBURG THEOLOGY—ITS PURPOSE AND PRINCIPLES

George W. Richards 42

PERSECUTION OF THE HUGUENOTS IN THE 18TH CENTURY

Shelby I. McCloy 56

MINUTES OF THE SOCIETY AND OF THE COUNCIL

80

CONTENTS

SURVEYS OF CURRENT RESEARCH	82
-----------------------------	----

BOOK REVIEWS:	91
---------------	----

McCASLAND, S. VERNON: <i>By the Finger of God: Demon Possession and Exorcism in Early Christianity in the Light of Modern Views of Mental Illness</i>	Harold R. Willoughby
---	----------------------

LAISTNER, M. L. W.: <i>Christianity and Pagan Culture in the Later Roman Empire</i>	Mervin M. Deems
---	-----------------

CHADWICK, OWEN: <i>John Cassian: A Study in Primitive Monasticism</i>	George Huntston Williams
---	--------------------------

COULTON, G. G.: <i>Five Centuries of Religion. Vol. IV: The Last Days of Medieval Monachism</i>	Ray C. Petry
---	--------------

CHRISTOLOGY AND CHURCH-STATE RELATIONS IN THE FOURTH CENTURY*

GEORGE HUNTSTON WILLIAMS

Harvard Divinity School

INTRODUCTION

"Let, whatsoever I will, be that esteemed a canon."¹ So retorted the Arianizing Emperor Constantius at the stormy council of Milan in 355 after he had become sole ruler of the Empire and was able to give full expression to his Arian sympathies. Whether Athanasius has accurately recorded his language is not certain; that he has captured the intention of Constantius in a vivid phrase is indisputable. It takes its place alongside James I's summary disposition of the Hampton Court Puritans, "No bishop, no king," to be set over against another series of resounding affirmations of a contrary significance: Ambrose of Milan's "the emperor is in the Church," and Andrew Melville's retort to the same James, "Sir, thair is *tw*e Kings and *tw*e Kingdoms in Scotland."²

It is clear that the conception one has of Christ and his several offices will affect one's view of Caesar and the legitimacy of his claims. For what the Christian is willing to render unto Caesar depends in part on his understanding of Christ as God and of Jesus' commandments as divine. Perhaps no dominical injunction has been rendered by christological elaboration more difficult in Christian practice, personal and corporate, than Jesus' supposedly simple distinction between the proper claims of Caesar and God. For even while denying his Kingdom to be of this world in the Gospel according to St. John, Jesus declared that the authority of Pilate was from God, and Christian theologians like Irenaeus³ and Origen⁴ soon placed the Roman Empire under the Eternal Logos even though the Kingdom of the Logos made flesh was expressly not of this world.

*Portions of this paper were presented at the December meeting of the American Society of Church History in Boston, 1949, and again, in March 1950, as the second in the annual Lowell Lectures on Religion. More recently the paper has been read by Prof. Glanville Downey of Dumbarton Oaks, currently lecturing in Cambridge, who has encouraged and stimulated me in the revision of the study for publication. As following footnotes will reveal, I am greatly indebted to him for his leads and insights and for generously placing at my disposal his translation of Themistius and the critical apparatus he has prepared for his forthcoming edition which will replace that of Wilhelm Dindorf (1832).

In the fourth century it was inevitable that the originally cosmopolitical significance of the Logos along with the more obviously political titles of Christ (Messiah, Saviour, Shepherd King, King of Kings, Son of Man, Son of God, Son of David, Kyrios) would be recovered and re-examined in the face of the new situation created by Constantine's espousal of Christianity. Christians in the Ante-Nicene period had for the most part recognized the Roman State, even when it persecuted them, as an order of creation, but emphatically not an order of redemption.⁵ Divinely ordained as a consequence of the Fall for the punishment of evil, the Roman Empire was at best the last of the Danielic empires holding back the final catastrophe and thus prolonging the time for the extension of the Gospel; and for this, of course, Christians prayed, commending the emperor in their liturgy.⁶ But now in the fourth century with the emperor a Christian, the state would seem to have significance as an ally of the Church or indeed as itself a secondary instrument of salvation by fostering, indeed, in the end by enforcing Christianity. Fourth century Christians were thus understandably confused in distinguishing between what they should render unto the Christian Caesar of a Christianized kingdom under God and what they owed to Christ whom they worshipped as God and whose Kingdom, the Church, was becoming more and more of this world by reason of its political assignment consequent upon imperial recognition.

To be sure, Tertullian had once pronounced the notion of a Christian emperor to be a contradiction of terms. And even Constantine himself seems to have felt the incongruity of being at once a Christian and an emperor. He put off the cleansing rite of baptism until the very end, never thereafter donning his imperial garb, as though he could not be a Christian emperor, but rather first an emperor and then, after baptismal purification, a Christian. As yet there was no pattern worked out for the Christianization of the wielder of power. Esteeming the morally rigorist emphasis in Christianity, Constantine had a kind of Novatianist view of the Church. The asceticism of the Donatists and Arius at first appealed to him. Indeed it was only the ascertained fact that they were a divisive influence which at length dictated his policy against them. Contemporary scholarship tends to rehabilitate the religious sincerity of Constantine, although his understanding of the new religion was admittedly limited. Our ascription of sincerity to Constantine does not, of course, rule out religious expediency of the old Roman type: *Do ut des*. This indeed remains the *leitmotif* of the Constantinian ecclesiastical policy. Soldier and

statesman, he saw in the Christian God a surety for victory, a new and proven heavenly sanction for the renewed monarchy, and in the Christian religion itself the cultic mortar and the theological scaffolding by means of which he might succeed in rehabilitating the imperial structure. Nor did his sense of the impossibility of reconciling imperial power and responsibility with a personal embodiment of the full Christian life constrain him as *pontifex maximus* from thinking of himself as *tōn ektois episkopos*, which, whatever else the obscure phrase may mean,⁷ embraced the bringing of the world to the worship of the One God with all the resources of imperial power.

Churchmen in the first flush of rejoicing at the quick succession of events which had made of the worst persecution a stormy prelude to unprecedented imperial favor, were perhaps less sensitive than their imperial patron to the difficulties attending the Christianization of government. Their uncritical acceptance of imperial patronage has indeed been called by many the Fall of Christianity, but the spectacle of over three hundred bishops, several of them confessors marked with the scars and mutilations of the recent fury of the Roman emperors, riding in imperial coaches to the first ecumenical council, could not but fill the participants themselves and the whole Christian Church with thoughts of the promised messianic age following the reign of Antichrist. The sumptuous repasts and splendid presents honoring the bishops and their ecclesiastical retinues in the palace could not but suggest the messianic banquet.⁸ It is the purpose of the present study to examine briefly some of the reasons for the initially uncritical submission of the Church to imperial supervision and then to show how the Arian controversy, which originally necessitated the summoning of the Council of Nicaea, became in the course of the fourth century the religio-political occasion for and in part the theological means of clarifying the proper relationship between the Church and the Christianized magistracy. We shall observe that among the Arians the biblical and the early Christian ambivalence in respect to the State was easily converted into an uncritically positive evaluation of the imperial *polis* and that among them Hellenistic ideas of kingship recovered an important place in an outwardly Christian frame, for Arianism could accommodate itself more readily than Catholicism to the assimilation of pagan conceptions of kingship and more lavishly compensate the ruler for relinquishing purely pagan attributes and honors.

We turn then to the reasons why the bishops, under the spell of the imperial conversion, were so ill-prepared to exercise the

caution that we might in retrospect desire. How could they so palpably overstate the divine character of imperial power merely because it was now in the hands of a Christian convert? There are several answers.

I. THE QUASI-DIVINITY OF EVEN THE CHRISTIAN EMPEROR

If before the Edict of Galerius Christians could think of the higher powers as ordained of God, of the emperor as placed in authority by the Logos himself,⁹ of the Empire as being sustained by the selfsame Logos to whom through prayers in the Holy Spirit they themselves commended the emperor,¹⁰ how much clearer all this would seem once the emperor himself had become a praying Christian. As Erik Peterson has shown, a line of positive evaluation of the Empire despite persecution runs from Luke through Quadratus, Melito of Sardis, Justin Martyr, Theophilus of Antioch, Origen, Eusebius of Caesarea, and Orosius.¹¹ In a more recent study, *Der Monotheismus als politisches Problem*,¹² Peterson has gone on to interrelate the political implications of pagan and Christian monotheism, showing how the positive evaluation of the Empire in terms of the Logos and allied concepts in the Ante-Nicene period ill-prepared the Christian bishops for coping with the vastly enlarged risks and opportunities in the fourth century situation and betrayed them at first into an uncritical acceptance of political support, until at length a fully understood Trinitarianism proved itself capable of resisting the exploitation of Christian monotheism as a means of sanctioning political unity and securing social cohesion. But up until the maintenance of full Trinitarian orthodoxy was politically imperilled, its destined defenders like Athanasius and Hosius of Cordoba proved to be, no less than the Arianizers, perceptive of the needs of political order and its theological undergirding. For example, Athanasius, in the youthful *Contra Gentes*, vividly likening the Logos to a king giving manifold orders in the construction of a city, describes the Logos of the Father who governs as by a nod the whole cosmos, causing all things to fall simultaneously into order and to discharge their proper functions.¹³

If before the Edict of Galerius Christians could think of the emperor as the image of God, how much easier it was after Caesar had become a Christian. The Epistle of Barnabas is perhaps the earliest witness to the appropriation of this concept by Christians as applied to the ruler.¹⁴ But since every Christian was thought to have recovered through rebirth in Christ the divine image destroyed or impaired by the first Adam, it was but natural that a Christian sov-

ereign be thought to have recovered in fullest measure the likeness of the Supreme Sovereign. An ancient pagan conception of the king as the image of God was now reinforced by the Christian view of salvation. It was a natural temptation to think of the Christian *basileus* as a more complete image of the King of kings than any ordinary Christian could hope to be. The enigmatic Ambrosiaster toward the end of the century will even republish the pagan doctrine of the subordination of religion to the needs of the *polis* in the lapidary formula: "The bishop has the image of Christ, the king the image of God."¹⁵ We shall discuss the late Nicene refinements of this kind of theological royalism below.

Another temptation confronted Christians in interpreting the nature and function of a Christian Caesar. Before the conversion of Constantine, they had been unambiguous in rejecting the divine pretensions of the emperors and in refusing them any kind of worship. But since they themselves understood salvation as a kind of deification, they could not deny to a Christian emperor what every Christian claimed for himself. God became man, that man might become divine, that is, immortal. This was, for example, the leading conviction of Athanasius. Clement of Alexandria had spoken freely of Christians as *theoi*.¹⁶ The Clementine *Recognitions*, the third-century *Didaschalia*, and the fourth-century revision thereof, the *Constitutiones Apostolorum*, describe the bishop as a god or after God, the earthly god of the dutiful and faithful Christian.¹⁷ Firmicus Maternus in the *Mathesis* declares that the emperor is placed in the chief ranks of the gods.¹⁸ Scriptures, moreover, had expressly declared that rulers are gods.¹⁹ Louis Bréhier and Pierre Batiffol have traced the survivals of the imperial cult into the Christian period²⁰ and Arthur Nock has carried his discussion of the divine *comes* of the emperor through Constantius.²¹ Although recent scholarship has tended to see less ambiguity in Constantine's policy towards Christianity and paganism than was once the case, the fact remains that the appeal of solar monotheism remained great, and the association of the emperor with the sun did not appear with Constantine's conversion. Theodor Preger's discussion of Constantine as Helios²² may be brought into connection with Hugo Rahner's abundantly documented study of the widespread Patristic symbolism which perpetuated pagan imagery, identifying Christ with the sun and the Church with the waxing and waning moon.²³ Christ, the Sun of Righteousness, frees Christians from astral fatalism. The sun and the moon obey the command of the Logos, says the *Epistle to Diognetus*,²⁴ which also stands out

among the earlier Christian writings as a witness to the Christian concern for the Empire. Once the emperor, still surrounded with the solar aura, acknowledged by Christians as the instrument of the Logos, has become himself a Christian, it will have been a great temptation to understand the waxing and waning of the lunar Church as her responses to the will of the solar emperor.

Without himself drawing any political inferences from his material, Johannes Quasten, in a number of recent studies of the Logos as Shepherd,²⁵ has likewise furthered our understanding of the problem faced by fourth century Christians in relating Christ the Logos-Shepherd to Caesar, behind whose person and office shimmered the ancient notions of the Logos as Shepherd and the righteous ruler as a Shepherd King. The Logos was thought of as a cosmic Shepherd, pasturing the stars in their courses and holding together the cosmos as flock, checking also the wayward elements in society, warding off the demonic forces of destruction and distortion, likened to marauding beasts. The Logos-Shepherd was also felt to work through the conscience and reason of every man, holding in check his flock of passions, herding them into the pastures proper for their grazing. Quasten finds the Logos-Shepherd in Philo²⁶, for example, Clement of Alexandria, and Eusebius, particularly in the latter's *Syrian Theophania*.²⁷

Having now reviewed some of the recent literature which throws light on how it was that the Christians in the early fourth century found it at first very difficult to distinguish between the proper functions of the Church and the reorganized Roman State unexpectedly headed by a Christian convert, I wish to show how the Arian controversy very soon became the occasion and also the means of clarifying those functions and of providing a theological definition of the proper relations between the episcopate and an increasingly Christian rulership of the Empire.

II. THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE ARIAN CONTROVERSY TO THE GRADUAL CLARIFICATION OF THE PROPER RELATION BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE

F. W. Buckler has in the pages of this journal and elsewhere²⁸ pointed out the Barbarian ideas of kingship in the background of the Arian understanding of the relationship of the Son to the Father. He has explained Arian subordinationism as the theological counterpart of the relationship between the Great King and his viceroy or satrap. Buckler understands the persistent outcropping of Arian

subordinationism in one form and another as the incursion or recrudescence of an originally "Barbarian" (i.e., Oriental) Christianity protesting against the assimilation of a primitively *political* Christological imagery to thoroughly uncongenial Greek philosophical categories. He suggests indeed a connection between the rise and imperial encouragement of Arianism and the assimilation of the court protocol and religio-political thought of the rival Sassanid Empire first appropriated by Aurelian and elaborated by Diocletian and Constantine in the interests of providing additional sanctions for the Roman Empire and its rulers. While I have been greatly stimulated by Prof. Buckler's several inquiries into political theology, my purpose in the present study is to suggest that it was precisely the biblical, and specifically the Old Testament undergirding of the later Nicene conviction that enabled the matured Athanasius, the bishops of Rome, Lucifer of Cagliari, Hilary of Poitiers, the Cappadocian Fathers, Chrysostom, and Ambrose, among others, to resist Christian emperors, especially the Arianizing Constantius, in the attempt to consolidate political absolutism by means of Christianity. The Nicene bishop, holding high his apostolic credentials, fully possessed of the Spirit promised by Christ, was himself a satrap or viceroy of the King of kings, challenging the credentials of the Arianizing emperor who presumed to act the viceroy of the Supreme God in Christ's Kingdom, the Church.

Schematically we may call the two contending concepts of Christ dominating the dogmatic history of the fourth century, the Catholic and the Arian²⁹. Over against the Catholic insistence on the consubstantiality of the Son, eventually made also explicit for the Holy Spirit, and the full deity and full manhood of Christ, are the various forms of subordination of the Son and the Holy Spirit worked out among the different Arianizing parties of the fourth century. Roughly speaking these two Christologies gave rise to, or are at least associated with, two main views of the Empire and the relationship of the Church thereto. According to one view the emperor is bishop of bishops.³⁰ According to the other, the emperor is within the Church.³¹

The purpose then of the present study is to explore the political and ecclesio-political implications of the two contending Christologies. That Christology, in the broadest sense of the word, was a matter of political concern in the fourth century needs, of course, no demonstration. Obviously Constantine, Constantius, and Theodosius cannot be relegated to the background of fourth century dogmatic history. That Christological terms could become the banners and slo-

gans in controversies growing primarily out of personal enmities, political expediency, metropolitan and patriarchal rivalries, regional and class tensions also needs no further documentation. The present inquiry concerns, rather, the influence of the contending Christologies themselves upon the political behavior and the ecclesio-political thought of their protagonists; in brief, the possible connection (1) between the Catholic insistence upon the consubstantiality of the Son and the championship of the independence of the Church of which he is the Head and (2) between the Arian preference for Christological subordination and the Arian disposition to subordinate the Church to the State. Whatever correlation there may be is of course obscured by the fact that Christological orthodoxy was initially defined under the presidency of one emperor and after a half century of controversy established by another. Yet all who have worked through the fourth century have sensed some affinity between Arianism and Caesaropapism on the one hand and on the other between Nicene orthodoxy and the recovery of a measure of ecclesiastical independence.

Before going on to point out the correlation, there are four initial observations to be made. First, the political implications of the rival Christologies were not at once perceived. In the beginning, Catholic and Arian alike contended for the support of the State. It was only in the throes of controversy that the Catholic bishops began to rethink the role of the Christian State, sobered after the first flush of rejoicing in the new political atmosphere. As Constantine came more and more to favor the Arian position, the Nicene leaders became increasingly critical of the influence of imperial power within the Church, and in the course of the controversy with the Arianizing Constantius (337-361), Julian the Apostate (361-363), and thereafter, the Nicene leaders developed their distinctive position, neither hostile nor obsequious, regarding the proper relationship of the Church to the State. The primarily soteriological convictions of the Orthodox proved to have political implications which the Arian controversy brought to the fore. Arianism proved in contrast, as it was developed by the court bishops, to be much more amenable to imperial policy and became, therefore, the imperially favored Christology of the middle years of the fourth century.

Secondly, we must distinguish between the party names hurled back and forth in the heat of controversy and the same designations when applied with the care of modern historians. There could be, for example, a Sabellianism that insisted upon the *homoousion* of the Second Person of the Trinity while being Adoptionist or in any event

ambiguous in respect to the deity of Christ, and another Sabellianism which insisted on the oneness of God the Father and Christ the Son. Extremes met. The right wing of Catholicity, Marcellus of Ancyra and Photinus, like the left wing of Arianism, Eunomius, collided in their very agreement, namely, in depreciating the significance of Jesus Christ. In the fourth century Sabellius and the Samosatene had in the persons of their most radical followers become one as regards the earthly Christ.

And this suggests the third point, which is simply a reminder of the abstract character of some of the principal terms of the fourth century controversy. In order of ascending abstraction, they are Jesus, Jesus Christ, the Son, the Logos, the Second Person of the Trinity. Roughly interchangeable as one moved back and forth from piety to exegesis, from liturgy to theology, from homiletics to philosophy, the terms were nevertheless distinguishable. Marcellus of Ancyra, a prominent figure in the Catholic camp, until his long delayed repudiation, claimed for the Logos what he long denied to the Son,⁵² "*Christ*."

Marcellus and Arius, who obliged their defenders and exasperated their foes in signing orthodox creeds, are there to remind us of a fourth important consideration. Surviving creeds are not entirely reliable transcripts of Christological opinion. Arians could write, not to say sign, semi-Arian, indeed Nicene-sounding creeds, since as exponents of broadchurchly views they were characteristically intent upon composing conciliatory symbols, for the most part content if their own position could but be included in a formula agreeable to the Catholics. As Sozomen reports, many of the later Arian principals confessed to having acquiesced in the Nicene Creed originally, lest an unseemly extension of controversy prompt the Emperor in disgust to withdraw his support from the Church he had so recently espoused. We must therefore go beneath the official documents if we are to get a clearer picture of the Christological views on either side of the main dividing line in fourth century controversy.

Behind the credal platforms hammered together in the mid-fourth century, often to conceal rather than to expose party differences, we observe three levels of discord between the Catholics and the Arians: on the soteriological, the strictly theologico-philosophical, and the ecclesio-political levels.

On the *soteriological* level the problem, stated schematically, was this: Is the Logos-Son primarily a mediator between God and the world in a cosmological sense, ordering the cosmos, human society,

and human personality, or is the Logos-Son a mediator primarily between the righteous and eternal God and sinful, mortal man in an historical redemption? Both the Catholic and the Arian spoke of the Logos and the Son interchangeably, but the center of their piety and speculation was different. In the wide range of pre-Christian Logos speculation we distinguish that recurrent emphasis which connects the rational with truth and that other emphasis which connects the rational with order. The former concern is, roughly speaking, philosophical (cosmological, etc.); the latter political (legal, etc.). Christians, in interpreting Christ as the Logos incarnate, had introduced both an *irrational* and a *disorderly* element into Logos speculation. Speaking schematically, we may say that the Catholic of the fourth century preserved the apostolic sense of the disparity and tension between reason and revelation. In his primarily soteriological concern, he understood the Logos as Mediator between a righteous and eternal God and sinful, mortal man by virtue of the Crucifixion and, as he became more speculative, the Incarnation. The Arian, in contrast, endeavored to rehabilitate the rational and the orderly aspects of the tradition, to accommodate revelation to reason³³ in the bright new age full of promise, the somber pre-Galerian period well behind him. In contrast, the Arian, because of his primarily cosmological interest, understood the Logos as Mediator between the Supreme God and the created world. In a sense, the principal act of mediation was creation itself. The Incarnate Logos was, in his mind—we shall take Eusebius of Caesarea as an example—confined to the modest role of proclaiming afresh the oneness of God and of reminding men of their natural immortality. The Arian was attentive to the Sermon on the Mount. The Catholic emphasized Bethlehem and Calvary. Both the Catholic and the Arian used *Logos* and *Son* interchangeably, but for the Arian, the Son was pre-eminently the Creator Logos; for the Catholic, the Logos incarnate. And this brings us to another difference.

On the strictly *theological* level the problem was whether the Logos-Son was subordinate to the Supreme God, which was the philosophical, cosmological view, or co-eternal and co-essential with God, which was the Nicene conviction on the ground that only He who was fully divine could save. For the philosophically minded Arianizer, the usefulness of the Logos concept lay precisely in the fact that the Logos was an intermediate, subordinate, divine potency, plane, or person, between the Supreme Deity and the world. For the Catholic, on the other hand, whose primary concern was soteriological, it

was essential to uphold the full deity of the Logos, the consubstantiality of the Son and the Father. For the Catholic, any essential subordination of the Son-Logos completely impaired Christ's soteriological role. The theological difference between the Catholic and the Arian may be stated in another way: *Deus* or *theos* meant to the Catholic, with his Sabellian antecedents, Christ. On being pressed, he assented to the philosophical distinctions intended to preserve the unity of Godhead and a distinction of persons. But since his primary concern was redemption, he will have given psychological priority to Christ. To the Arian, in contrast, *deus* or *theos* meant the Supreme God, as he preferred to call him. On being pressed, he assented to the utter likeness of the Son and the Father, and in certain political situations he could even be prevailed upon to subscribe to the *homoousion*, but for the most part publicly he preferred the *homoiousion*, and privately he found *homoios* quite satisfactory; he even entertained the possibility that the Son and the Father were dissimilar. This composite Arian of the fourth century was in all his several phases consistent with himself in this fact, at least, that his primary concern was cosmological.

Orosius, who is not, of course, an authority for the events, is valuable as a witness to the general impression left in the West by the Arians. Constantius, he writes, supported the Arians "in seeking to find gods in God."⁸⁴ The Arians, for their part, were not entirely wrong in their general impression that many of their opponents were near Sabellians. The great Catholic leaders whose works have survived make more theological concessions in the interests of philosophical exactitude than the piety of the party would have in their day required. Though never so stated by either side in the controversy, the Arians were content to understand Christ as similar in essence or simply similar to the One God of the philosophical monotheism of the day. The Nicenes, in contrast, although they too accepted the philosophical definitions of God as impassible and transcendent, nevertheless preserved or recovered more of the biblical view of God as Creator, Lord of history, and final Judge and were intense in their conviction that Christ is one in every essential respect with the God of the Old Testament.

Herewith we are brought to the *ecclesio-political* level. In insisting that the God of Creation, of Redemption, and the Final Assize is essentially one God, the Catholics were contending that the Lord of Calvary is also the Lord of the Capitol. But for this very reason the typical Nicenes were unwilling to accommodate revelation

to reason purely in the interest of enhancing the cohesive value of Christianity for the Empire. In contrast, the Arians, having a comparatively low Christology were pleased to find in their emperor a divine epiphany or instrument or indeed a demigod like Christ himself. Thus the Arians were more disposed than the Nicenes to accept the will of an emperor as a canon and to defer to him as bishops, because the canons, tradition, and scriptural law centering in the *historical* Christ could not possibly in their eyes take precedence over the living law (*nomos empsuchos*) of the emperor ordained by the *eternal Logos*. The Nicenes, by reason of the crucial importance they attached to the historic Logos incarnate held fast to revealed and known laws against the will of the emperor however Christian. They put one in mind of the later Puritan hostility to the equity of the courts of Chancery based upon the royal prerogative as distinct from *known* common law. The Nicenes came in time to be much more alert than the Arians to the impropriety of fusing the two societies, the one the bearer of revelation, the extended body of the incarnate Logos, the other the Empire, the instrument of the eternal Logos for the maintenance of social order. Nor were Catholics averse to mingling a little dynamite³⁵ with the social cement they were expected to supply to the Empire in return for protection. The Christological issue fought out with mounting valor and increasing discernment by a handful of Nicene theologians was of momentous consequence for the religio-political history of the West.

One may distinguish today at least four sectors in which theologico-political combat in the fourth century was strategically crucial: A. The authority of the emperor in respect to creed and canon, B. The Eucharistic aspect of the problem, C. The prophetic office of the bishop, D. The headship and kingship of Christ. To the first of these four problems we now turn.

A. IS A CHRISTIAN CAESAR, RULER BY THE GRACE AND PROVIDENCE OF GOD³⁶ AND DIVINE VICAR, THE SOURCE OF ECCLESIASTICAL LAW OR SUBJECT TO IT?

Eusebius, the Arianizing bishop of Caesarea, is clearly a point of confluence of all the Oriental, Hellenistic, and Ante-Nicene Christian conceptions of kingship and a key figure in determining the ways in which Christology will dispose its exponents to be positive or critical toward a Christian Caesar. By reason of the meagerness of materials surviving from the pens of outright Arians, the Father of Church history must be pressed into service as a representative subordinationist. Any analysis of Eusebius' political theology must

necessarily draw heavily on the *Vita Constantini*. The fact, therefore, that this "biography" has undergone revisions and received interpolations during the reign of Arianizing Constantius³⁷ or that it is the work of an Arian Pseudo-Eusebius (possibly Euzoius of Caesarea)³⁸ actually enhances its value as a basis for comparing Arian and Catholic theologies of the State.

Norman Baynes, prompted by the study of Erwin Goodenough on Hellenistic kingship,³⁹ has shown how the Hellenistic idea of the king as animate law lived on in the political thought of Eusebius of Caesarea.⁴⁰ He characterizes Eusebius' tricennialian oration as "the clearly stated . . . political philosophy of the Christian Empire." To be sure, the Logos is no longer, as with Ecphantus, for example (quoted by Strobæus), held to be incarnate in the true king with power to benefit men. With Eusebius, however, the emperor is the interpreter and imitator of the Logos and as such no less than with Ecphantus a divine saviour. Baynes does not attempt to relate Eusebius' assimilation of Hellenistic political ideas to the bishop's Arianizing tendencies. His essay is completed in the identification or characterization of the efforts of Constantine and Eusebius to secure Christian sanctions for the New Monarchy as the imperial *mimēsis* of the Logos. It is my purpose to go on from here to distinguish between *Logomimēsis* and *Theomimēsis*. With both pagan philosophical and Old Testament variants of monotheism in mind Eusebius was never quite certain whether it was the rule of the Father-Creator (O. T.) or the Logos-Creator (pagan philosophy) upon which the Christian emperor modeled his reign. In any event the Christian emperor was thought of as coordinate with the Logos-Christ, dispersing the demonic forces of disorder by arms and laws as had Jesus by miracles and parables. Not until the Council of Chalcedon defined the Logos-Christ as fully man and fully God with Mary as *Theotokos* can the religio-political conduct and cosmology of the emperors be characterized as *Christomimēsis*.⁴¹ The Iconoclastic controversy, for example, will be fought out between the Isaurians and the iconodules on precisely this issue, namely, whether it is the clergy within the Church with its altar and icons as the ongoing incarnation of Christ, his Body, or the emperor as *basileus kai hierēus* over Christ's Kingdom which is the *visible* bearer of the authority and glory of Christ on earth.⁴² But in the pre-Chalcedonian epoch and especially before the clarification of the formula of 325 by the re-statement of 381, the Christological orthodoxy *eventuelle* was inchoate or at least imperfectly articulated even in the most earnest of Nicene

circles. Eusebius of Caesarea, by the very expansiveness of his Christological ambiguity, helps us to understand how the Arians could think of the historic Christ as a demigod and of the emperor as the imitator of the Eternal Logos (humbled and obscured in the earthly Christ) or of the Father (= the Supreme God), while the authentic Nicenes held tenaciously to the historic Christ who, by his unique and paradoxical act of divine self-sacrifice at once secured the eternal salvation of mankind *and established the ecclesiastical law to which even the Christian sovereign is subject*. The Christological presuppositions of the ecclesio-political controversy of the middle of the fourth century are only in our day being gradually clarified.

Spurred on by Opitz' distinction between the cosmological and the soteriological interests in interpreting the Logos, the Dutch church historian, Hendrik Berkhof, undertook a full-length study of Eusebius,⁴³ explaining the ambiguities of Eusebius' Christology and political thought as a consequence of the metropolitan's twofold role as Origenist apologist and conscientious exegete. That Christianity was the oldest religion Eusebius endeavored to show by his several histories and chronologies, basic to which was the doctrine of the Eternal Logos, guiding directly or through angels the destinies of all peoples and preparing the philosophical mind of Greece for a final disclosure of Truth. That Christianity was the most rational religion he likewise demonstrated in appealing to the Logos, emphasizing the cosmological mediation between the Supreme God, well understood by Neoplatonists, and the creaturely or material world. To construe this Logos, as the Nicene divines insisted on doing, as consubstantial with the Supreme God, to efface theologically the essential philosophical subordination of the Logos to the Supreme God, was to undo the very value the Logos concept possessed for one whose philosophical background was an Origenistic Neoplatonism with its cascade of decreasingly divine potencies from the Supreme, impassible, transcendent One, through the Logos-Son and the Holy Spirit, the chief of spirits, to angels and men.⁴⁴ So, Eusebius, the philosophical apologist. But Eusebius, the biblical scholar, was obliged to recognize that the Supreme God was involved directly in creation. His fealty to Scripture pressed him to explain the voluntarist and irrational aspects of revelation as best he could. But following his master Origen, mostly by way of simplification and reduction, Eusebius understood the self-disclosure of the Logos incarnate to be little more than the reminder that man is immortal if he will but conform to the eternal law of the Logos, restated in a particularly winsome form in the

Sermon on the Mount. Historian and exegete though he was, Eusebius was unable to make either the Incarnation⁴⁵ or the Crucifixion central in his theology. He was philosophically unprepared to construe history as a primary vehicle of Eternal Truth. History was for him, rather, the area in which Eternal Truth had been confirmed and, to be sure, vindicated in the extraordinary expansion of the Church as the bearer of Truth.

In robbing Bethlehem and Calvary of their primacy, Eusebius greatly enhanced the relative significance of the Milvian Bridge and the New Rome for the salvation of mankind. Intent upon bringing reason and revelation into harmony, Eusebius was unable to make a clear distinction between the Church founded by the Incarnate Logos and the Empire—once its ruler had become Christian. To Eusebius the humane legislation and the general peace made the realm of Constantine appear to be the fulfillment of the ancient prophecies of the Kingdom of God. Nor does the Church founded by Christ seem to have the importance for him, church historian though he was, that it did for more Catholic divines. Eusebius was quite prepared, for example, to designate as a Church the household of the unbaptized Constantine assembled for instruction and worship in the palace.⁴⁶ He was pleased to think of his Emperor as an interpreter of Almighty God,⁴⁷ *isapostolos*⁴⁸ by reason of his vision on the road to Rome,⁴⁹ and was delighted in the role of Constantine as the bishop of those outside the Church.⁵⁰ With a comparatively low doctrine of the Church, a consequence of his earnest, but withal limited conception of the earthly ministry of the Incarnate Logos, Eusebius (or the fully Arian Pseudo-Eusebius) was understandably tempted into comparing Christ and Constantine (or, by implication, Constantius) as alike instruments or manifestations of the one Eternal Logos, the former to preach monotheism, to exorcise demons, and to proclaim God's Kingdom; the latter to establish monotheism and by routing the lesser gods around which the demonic forces of nationalism and dissension centered,⁵¹ to usher in the long promised peace of the messianic age.⁵² In thus enthusiastically comparing Caesar and Christ it was indeed hard for Eusebius not to leave the impression that the work of a Christian Caesar was of more importance than the work of Christ.⁵³ In any event Constantine was for Eusebius a kind of second saviour. Just as "the universal Saviour opens the gates of his Father's Kingdom to those whose course is thitherward from this world," so the "Emperor, emulous of his divine example, having purged his earthly dominion from every strain of impious error, invites each holy and pious

worshiper within his imperial mansions, earnestly desiring to save with all its crew the mighty vessel of which he is the appointed pilot."⁵⁴ Having dedicated to the universal Sovereign that most acceptable sacrifice, even his own imperial soul,⁵⁵ the Emperor in the manner of "a wise instructor"⁵⁶ or again of "a good shepherd,"⁵⁷ "imitating the divine philanthropy,"⁵⁸ leads the souls of his imperial flock to the knowledge of the Sovereign Lord of all. Eusebius can scarcely decide whether Constantine is more like the Logos incarnate (*Christomimēsis*) or the cosmic Logos (*Logomimēsis*) or like the Supreme God himself (*Theomimēsis*). He moves eloquently from one comparison to the other. In any event, "appointed by, and the representative of the one Almighty Sovereign,"⁵⁹ Constantine ("The only one to whose elevation no mortal may boast of having contributed"⁶⁰) "directs his gaze above, and frames his earthly government according to the pattern of that divine original, feeling strength in its conformity to the monarchy of God."⁶¹ In short, the ancient oracles and predictions of the prophets seemed in him fulfilled.⁶²

The facility with which Eusebius could assimilate the Constantinian with the Messianic peace is connected, as we have already noted, with the fact that for Eusebius the Logos was a subordinate *deuteros theos*, a mediator primarily in the cosmological rather than in the religious sense. Hence salvation was understood as coming through the might of a godly ruler. It was the recovery of truth and order. In contrast, for an Athanasius, to take a representative Nicene, salvation was, as it were, through the mouth, the recovery of immortality through participation in the historic Eucharistic fellowship. Eusebius of Caesarea was only a semi-Arian but the Christological difference between him and the typical Catholic of his time was great. And the emphasis was such that it was natural for him and other Arianizers to think of the emperor as the image or the instrument of either the Eternal Logos or of the Supreme God. In establishing order and harmony, the emperor was performing on earth what Eusebius regarded as the principal function of the Logos in and over the cosmos. Christ and the Christian emperor are in the thought of Eusebius almost coordinate in honor, each under the Supreme God, each in his special way leading men to the knowledge and worship of God, each complementing the other in bringing order and peace to mankind.

Eusebius, like his master Origen, held in effect that man is immortal by nature rather than by the grace of Christ. Having thus toned down irruptive and paradoxical aspects of revelation, having shared Helen's enthusiasm for the Cross without really being able

to assimilate it into his system, Eusebius instinctively felt that the Christian *basileus* on the throne was a fuller image of the *Pambasileus* than the apostolic *hiereus* at the Christian altar. There was no place in the thought of Eusebius (or the Arian Reviser) for two related but distinct societies, the Church and the Christianized State, each with its special task under Christ as *Basileus kai Hiereus*, but rather one God, one emperor, one religion, and a single-minded dutiful episcopate.⁶³ For such was the religio-political conviction and program of Eusebius, earning for him the title of herald of Byzantinism⁶⁴ in proclaiming the Empire as the primary image and reflection of the heavenly Kingdom, the Kingdom of God in time.

The connection between a subordinationist Christology and a weak ecclesiology in Eusebius (and the Arian Reviser of the *Vita*) is fairly clear. It would be desirable to examine the thought of other fourth century court bishops with even more marked Arian leanings but the sources, of course, are wanting. Eusebius' namesake and fellow-Lucianist, bishop successively of Berytus, Nicomedia, and Constantinople, is known more by his acts than by his recorded political theory. He has left us a very clear statement of his Arian convictions, which indeed at first brought him into disfavor with Constantine at Nicaea, who at all costs desired unity without understanding the fine points of theological controversy. But Eusebius soon contrived to rehabilitate himself and then Arius and gain tremendous influence over the Post-Nicene Constantine whom he baptized and over Constantius by whom⁶⁵ he was translated in 328⁶⁶ from the old capital (Nicomedia) to the new capital (Constantinople). Related by blood to the Constantinian family,⁶⁷ Eusebius wielded great influence at court, linked as he was with Constantia and with Helen, the latter devoted like himself to his teacher, Lucian of Antioch.⁶⁸ Bishop of the old Diocletianic and the Constantinian capital, Eusebius pursued with energy and cunning, as head of the large party named after him, a policy of strengthening imperial authority over the Church and of undercutting the rival proto-patriarchal sees of Rome, Antioch, and notably, of course, Alexandria. It is significant that he emphasized political insubordination among the charges he brought against his ecclesiastical rivals and theological foes: against Marcellus, disobedience; against Paul whom he supplanted in Constantinople, disorder; against Eustathius of Antioch, disrespect of the Empress-Mother; against Athanasius, fomenting Egyptian opposition to imperial sway.⁶⁹

Cyril of Jerusalem⁷⁰ who was more than deferential to Constantius and recounted the spectacle of a luminous Cross over Jerusa-

lem in divine approbation of the Arian's victory over Magnentius⁷¹ was just a good semi-Arian and adds no more to the argument than Eusebius of Nicomedia. Eunomius, the full Arian bishop of Cyzicus (d. 393), has the distinction of being represented in the surviving literature by a complete writing from his own hand, but this does not provide us with sufficient material for a christological analysis of Arian political theory and practice.⁷² What can be gleaned from Catholic refutations of his theological position will be discussed in another connection.⁷³ On Acacius and Asterius the material is even scantier. The appendix to Athanasius' Letter LVI to Jovian⁷⁴ reproduces the petitions of a number of Arians led by Lucius of Alexandria, but they are the words of suppliants, no longer filled with a sense of imperial mission as in the days of Constantius. They merely seek authorization as a tolerated sect in Alexandria. Significantly, however, they speak of Julian the Apostate as most religious and philosophical, and characteristically, even in their extremity seek episcopal appointment from the Catholic Emperor. Arians, even when not favored by the State, show no disposition to carry on organizationally without imperial approbation.

The Arianizing Syrian "Constitututor"⁷⁵ of the *Constitutiones Apostolorum*⁷⁶ provides us with a good but small specimen of his political thinking when, appealing to Daniel 2:34, he speaks of Christ as "the stone cut out of the mountains . . . , dashing to pieces the many governments of the smaller countries, and the polytheism of gods, but preaching the one God and ordaining the monarchy of the Romans."⁷⁷ Both the third century *Didascalia* and the Arian expansion contain a section in which the bishop is to be honored as a father, as a king and indeed as God (ii, 34). At first glance the survival of this material in the Arian revision would seem to weaken the thesis of the present study. On close inspection of the emendations, however, it becomes clear that the Arian has no intention of exalting episcopal authority above that of kings which was, indeed, the purport of the original section. The Arian "Constitututor," for example, omits the long quotation of I Sam. 8:10-17 in which the anti-Solomonic editor describes the servitude and wretchedness to be expected from kingship. While he strengthens the authority of the bishop and increases the emoluments of his office, the Arian reviser is equally concerned to soften or entirely efface the anti-imperial element in the section of the Ante-Nicene *Didascalia* he emends. The Arian "Constitututor" shows the same interest in kingship in his revision of vi, 1-3. The *Didascalia* at this point was interested only in schism and separation, that seem-

ingly of the rigorists. The *Constitutiones*, using some of the materials, is concerned to demonstrate biblically the wickedness of rising up against both bishops and kings. And while the "Constitutor" does mention King Uzziah, who ventured to usurp the priesthood, he devotes a whole chapter to Moses as both high priest *and* king, and deplores the sedition raised up by schismatics against the administrator of divine things.⁷⁸ The "Constitutor" displays a concern for political order as well as internal ecclesiastical order in other emendations and expansions of his material, insisting at several points that Christians must fear the king, knowing that his appointment is of the Lord (*Kyrios*)⁷⁹ and that the law of righteousness shines by means of the Romans. "For these Romans, believing in the Lord, left off their polytheism and injustice, and entertain the good and punish the bad."⁸⁰ Here the thought of Eusebius of Caesarea is restated. We cannot, of course, press the Arian character of the compilation, but we are fortunate in being able to cite its emendations and expansions to supplement the meagre material we possess from the hands of the Arian divines.

From the Arianizing clerics we may turn to the most important of Arian emperors, Constantius,⁸¹ with a view to gaining some further insight into the bearing of Christological convictions upon the relationship between the Church and the Empire. It is clear that Constantius was personally moral and religious to the point of being superstitious⁸² and that like his father he was concerned to employ Christianity as a unitive force in the Empire.⁸³ According to Theodoret, Constantius, the better to fight the usurper Magnentius, mustered the whole of his army, counseled them to receive the baptismal robe, and dismissed all who declined baptism, declaring that he chose not to fight with men who had no part or lot in Christian rites.⁸⁴ While this speech as it stands can scarcely be genuine, since the Emperor himself was unbaptized at the time, it may nevertheless attest to a general recognition of a broadly Christian piety. Moreover, unlike his father, Constantius was unambiguous in his hostility to the gross forms of paganism,⁸⁵ eventually persecuting its devotees with cruelty.

At the same time he was greatly impressed by the political philosophy of the pagan monotheist Themistius (c. 317-88)⁸⁶ whose panegyric portrayals of the ideal ruler may well have exercised an influence upon Constantius' political theology.⁸⁷ Several of them were addressed to him, one (I) in Ancyra in 350 delivered on the occasion of the Emperor's return from the Persian front (Singara), another (III) on the occasion of Constantius' triumphal entry into Rome in

357, another one (II) before the Constantinopolitan Senate (Nov. 355) in response to his imperial appointment as senator (Sept. 1, 355). We possess Constantius' long letter which honors the orator publicist by this appointment and reveals the personal esteem of the Emperor for the political philosopher and his learned father.⁸⁸ Constantius therein declares that the true philosophy does not separate one from the life of the community. Philosophy is in fact dedicated to the task of forming good citizens. Eventually Constantius was to honor Themistius still further with the erection of a bronze statue in Constantinople,⁸⁹ and there are many other instances of the Emperor's high esteem for the orator-*philosophe*.⁹⁰

It so happens that a copy of the Constantinopolitan oration (II) reached Milan where Constantius had only recently faced his Nicene opponents with his plans for an imperially enforced theological union. At the stormy council of 355, which he had peremptorily reconvened in the palace, Constantius tried to cajole Pope Liberius into condemning Athanasius,⁹¹ demanded that the Church take his imperial word for a canon,⁹² and indeed played the part of a philosopher king as idealized by Themistius, Libanius, and Synesius of Cyrene.⁹³

The true king, according to Themistius (especially in I) is a born king. Through his inborn royal virtue and reason he subdues not only his own passions—and in this Constantius had succeeded in contrast to Constans—but also the dissensions of society. The true king prefers persuasion to force and in this we are reminded of Constantius' efforts to persuade Liberius in the celebrated interview⁹⁴ in which the Emperor stands out as at least more considerate than the ill-informed eunuchs and court bishops who heckled the Pope. Constantius resorted to the expedient of exile only when Liberius proved to be obdurate. The Emperor was also uncommonly patient in responding to the invective of Lucifer of Cagliari.

The true king, to continue with Themistius, is not the ruler of one people, class or religion; he is the just ruler and saviour of all. The emperor is to be like God in all respects,⁹⁵ a heavenly being,⁹⁶ but his chief virtue, wherein he is most like God, is his *philanthropia*.⁹⁷ His mind intent upon heaven, he strives to be the image of God, constructing his earthly empire on the model of that above.⁹⁸ This imitation (*homoiōsis*) is the imitation of God's fatherhood, from which stems brotherhood throughout the Empire.⁹⁹ God in his paternal concern for mankind sends kings and philosophers, the latter to teach, the former to govern in accordance with philosophical precepts. The authority of the emperor stems not from the people or the army but from God.¹⁰⁰ The

emperor is personified law (*nomos empsuchos*)¹⁰¹ and thus his word may be taken for a canon, since the order of the cosmos is the model for his righteous rule. He may overturn apostolic law and tradition. The whole authority of Sacred Scriptures may be dissolved by imperial authority.¹⁰² Themistius, the pagan monotheist, thrice quotes to give universal cogency to his argument, what he calls "Assyrian Scriptures,"¹⁰³ namely Prov. 21:1: "The king's heart is in the hand of the Lord."¹⁰⁴

If it is running ahead of the established facts to say that Themistius contributed to Constantius' philosophy of kingship,¹⁰⁵ at least we may take Themistius as representative of the cultured pagan thought which Constantius found congenial. And we may suppose that his Arian bishops read and quoted Themistius, their contemporary, with as much satisfaction as did the cultured classes of Byzantine society generations after them. Moreover, Ammianus Marcellinus' portrait of Constantius comports well with this view. Ammianus, for example, describes the hieratic rigidity of Constantius approaching Rome for the *vincennalia*, as though he were imitating the impassible ruler of heaven, turning "his eyes neither to the right nor to the left, as if he had been a statue: nor when the carriage shook him did he nod his head . . . , nor was he ever seen to move a hand."¹⁰⁶ The same historian says that Constantius, elated by courtly adulation, at times, spoke of his own *aeternitas* and "in writing letters in his own hand, would style himself lord of the whole world."¹⁰⁷ Ammianus remarks bitterly that the imperial successes had so strengthened Constantius' confidence in the divine rightness of his course that he thought himself raised to an equality with heaven (*caelo contiguus*), while his soldiers, interrupting his speech naming Julian a Caesar, hailed his decision as an *arbitrium summi numinis*.¹⁰⁸ In his harangue before the soldiers on the Persian front at the end of his reign, Constantius, as reported by Ammianus, confidently appealed to the present help of the most high Deity (*favore numinis summi praesente*).¹⁰⁹ It is just possible that this monotheistic but not specifically Christian phrasing is an authentic transcript, not attributable to the pagan annalist's own theological preferences. In any event evidence is sufficient to make it probable that for Constantius, God was the Supreme God without distinctively Christian attributes. That Christ was like God, *homoios*, was the most that he could understand and personally accept. But after all, he too, as an emperor, was in the process of becoming or acting like God, *homoiōsis*.¹¹⁰ Moreover, it was probably of God as Father that he more commonly felt himself to be the earthly image of

the divine. Arian that he was, Constantius will have more easily imagined himself imitating the Father of heaven,¹¹¹ Jovian in features and attributes, than the suffering Son of Calvary. And as an Arian, he will have thought of his imperial acts as coordinate with, rather than imitative of, those of Christ.

Ancient conceptions of the relationship of the emperor to Deity were very much alive in Constantius. As death approached, he reported that he felt his familiar spirit (*genius*) departing from himself.¹¹² This disclosure, when expanded in the light of comparative religion, connects Constantius with a whole cycle of religio-political thought which Arthur Nock has brought together under the heading of the divine companion (*comes, genius*).¹¹³

Yet for all the pagan survivals, Constantius was undoubtedly sincere and earnest, personally and politically¹¹⁴ in his espousal of Christianity in the form he preferred. His predilection for Arianism becomes increasingly clear, especially when the death of Constans freed him from the political and military necessity of theological compromise.¹¹⁵ Although he was intent upon a theological reunion, his personal Christological views dictated a pro-Arian policy regardless of political expediency, for he had at length become convinced that his political successes were to be viewed as the divine approbation of his ecclesiastical policy.¹¹⁶ Had expediency alone determined his strategies, Constantius would have become more conciliatory toward the Nicenes rather than less after taking over the more Catholic West on the death of Constans. But Arianism had already commended itself as the more rational form of Christian monotheism, and Arians had proved to be better court bishops than the puzzlingly unaccommodating and seemingly wilful Nicenes.¹¹⁷ When Constantius insisted in 355 at Milan that his will be esteemed a canon, he went on: The bishops of Syria let me thus speak. Either then obey or go into banishment.¹¹⁸ And to the bishops at the Synod of Rimini in 359 he wrote firmly, enjoining them to take no action against the Oriental bishops and stating emphatically that any decision reached at Rimini would have no force without his express approbation.¹¹⁹

It is indeed possible that Constantius regarded himself as the divinely appointed head of the episcopate. Lucifer mocks the Arian bishops for considering him *episcopus episcoporum*,¹²⁰ and there may be still another allusion to Constantius' conception of himself as the chief of the apostolate in Lucifer's excoriation of him as a *pseudoapostolus*,¹²¹ who as a *pseudochristianus* presumes to be transformed into an *apostolus Christi*, qualified to depose and exile Catholic bishops

and install—he actually says, “ordain”¹²²—Arians in their places.¹²³ Athanasius is likewise spirited in denouncing Constantius’ invention of a new kind of episcopal appointment.¹²⁴

We may set down this increasingly explicit Catholic criticism of imperial authority by recalling some of their more familiar declarations. Eustathius of Antioch, for example, after his deposition at the hands of the Eusebians, denounced his calumniators as Ariomaniaes, atheists,¹²⁵ and sycophants.¹²⁶ Arianizers were atheists because they denied the full deity of the Son and were sycophants in their excessive devotion to the emperor, his agents and informers. Athanasius makes a similar charge. After he had himself finally come to a clear understanding of the proper limits of the power of the emperor,¹²⁷ Athanasius declared angrily that the Arians had no other king but Caesar.¹²⁸ In denying the full Deity of Christ, the Arians were Judaizers, Athanasius was contending, for like the chief priests of Israel, they failed to honor Christ as *Pambasileus*. In this wrathful ejaculation, Athanasius scored Arianism for tolerating, indeed facilitating the preservation of the ancient notions of the divine presence or likeness of the ruler in a Christian guise. He gives additional color to his charge in describing the connivance of Arians and pagans in the tumults and pillaging in Alexandria in 339¹²⁹ and 356.¹³⁰ Athanasius pointed out in contempt that they who at Sirmium in 359 denied the Son to be eternal were quite prepared to introduce their dated creed with a reference to its publication in the presence of the *eternal* emperor, that they who pretended to be writing about the Lord willingly nominated another master of themselves, namely, Constantius.

To sum up, then, the Arianizing view of the divine authority of the Christian emperor, as we have been able to reconstruct it from the meagre and disparate remains: The emperor is either the imitator or the interpreter of either the Logos or the Supreme God (in Arian Christian terms, the Father), himself a kind of god coordinate in function with the demigod Christ, and as such the living law in a monolithic, monotheistic Church-Empire opposed alike to divisive polytheism and disruptive Nicene Trinitarianism.

Over against this trend abetted by Constantius, the high Nicene view of the ruler became increasingly distinct, especially after Julian’s apostasy made clear that the Christianized Empire was not the prophetically foretold millennial realm which Eusebius once imagined.¹³¹ Over against the claims of divine likeness made by and for the emperor on the Arian side were the repeated efforts of the Nicenes, for example at Sardica, to insist that Christ is the Son of God in a way quite dif-

ferent from Christians in general. What Christians may be by grace, he is by nature. The political implications of their defense of the full deity of Christ could not be in doubt. Gregory Nazianzen, though he acknowledged that the emperor and also the lesser imperial officials ruled along with Christ and were indeed the image of God, reminded these rulers that it was also over the image of Christ that they ruled.¹³² Ambrose of Milan vigorously denounced the impiety of the Arians who in saying that "Christ is distinct from the only and true God," failed to place him before other men, making of him but one of the gods or God-possessed holy men of the kind mentioned in the Bible, i.e. Psalm 82, "Ye are gods." Ambrose, like many other Nicene divines, was anxious to distinguish between the deity of Christ and the mere divinization and godlikeness which an emperor might claim to be his as a Christian. Ambrose of Milan, in the oversimplification of holy intolerance, suggested how the low Christology of the Arians encouraged the accommodation of Christianity to religious-political necessities in remarking that the Arian, who calls Christ a creature, can very well come to terms with pagan and Jew because therein also they are agreed.¹³³

The Nicenes, like Chrysostom,¹³⁴ were at length pushed to distinguish the power of the office as divine from the incumbent of the office. Moreover, there lingered in the Nicene view of the State the conception of its being sustained by angelic power under Christ.¹³⁵ The Nicenes were therefore the more alert to the possibility of an angelic power becoming demonic through wilfulness. In any event, Athanasius, Lucifer of Cagliari,¹³⁶ and Hilary of Poitiers were at length prompted to rehabilitate the language of Daniel and Revelation when occasion demanded, denouncing the emperor as the forerunner of Antichrist or as Antichrist himself.

All this the Nicenes could see more or less clearly by the middle of the century. The proper relationship between the episcopate and the Christianized rulership could not be so clear at the beginning of the controversy, either to the Arians or to the Catholics—even Athanasius.

One of the sources of Nicene conviction and solidarity was the confidence that the Christ who ruled indirectly through the emperor ruled immediately through the Church in which He was ever present. We next turn to an examination of the political significance of the Nicene faith in the Eucharistic Christ and the accompanying sense of the divine immediacy within the liturgical community.

(To be concluded.)

- 1 Athanasius, *Historia Arianorum*, 33.
- 2 Melville continues: "Chryst Jesus the King, and his kingdome the Kirk, whase subject King James the Saxt is; and of whase kingdome nocht a king, nor a lord, nor a heid, but a member!"
- 3 Below, n. 9.
- 4 Below, n. 10.
- 5 This it was, of course, for pagans offering sacrifice to their imperial *sôtër, dominus et deus*.
- 6 The practice is monographically traced by Ludwig Biehl, *Das liturgische Gebet für Kaiser und Reich: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Verhältnisse von Kirche und Staat*, Görres-Gesellschaft, Heft 75 (Paderborn, 1937).
- 7 On this see n. 50.
- 8 Cf. Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*, iii, 15.
- 9 For example, Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses*, v, 24, 1.
- 10 Origen, *Contra Celsum*, viii, 75. Origen countered the religio-political argument of Celsum that Christian monotheism was at once a cosmic and a political rebellion by insisting that the Logos is destined to achieve through the rational in man the universal recognition and observance of the divine *nomos*. *Ibid.*, 72.
Origen also laid the bases for the later monastic and ascetic view of the State according to which he who lives not in the world need not pay tribute to Caesar. *Comment. in Rom.* 9:25; Migne, *P. G.*, XIV, coll. 1180 ff. The significance of Origen at this point is brought out by Wilfred Parsons. "The Influence of Romans XIII on Pre-Augustinian Christian Political Thought," *Theological Studies*, I (1940), p. 337.
- 11 "Kaiser Augustus im Urteil des antiken Christentums," *Hochland*, XXX (1933), pp. 289 ff. The date is significant. Peterson was wide awake to the spurious character of the Nazi appeal for a "positive Christianity." He had previously published "Göttliche Monarchie," *Theologische Quartalschrift*, CXII (1931), pp. 537 ff. The fact that religion today has been given a political assignment comparable to that which it was expected to acquit itself of in the fourth century, gives a special relevance to the studies of Peterson and similar inquiries. The appeal to positive Christianity in Nazi Germany, to Orthodoxy behind the Iron Curtain, to Shinto in Japan, and to Protestantism in democracy—often in the diffuse hope and confidence that God will even further bless America—are all contemporary ways in which religion has been asked to provide tonus, sanctions, and cohesiveness. It is commonly overlooked now as in the fourth century that Christianity, if it be true to its divine commission, judiciously mingles a prophetic explosive with the social cement it is asked to supply.
- 12 Leipzig, 1935. This book is a reworking and rich documentation of the two foregoing articles. Peterson borrows the term "political theology" from Carl Schmitt who first introduced it in the present sense in *Politische Theologie* (Munich, 1922). The views of Schmitt and Peterson are compared and criticized by Andreas Marxen, *Das Problem der Analogie zwischen der Seinsstrukturen der grossen Gemeinschaften* (Würzburg, 1937).
- 13 Op. cit., 43. In *Apologia ad Constantium*, ii, he writes: "Search into the matter, as though Truth were the partner of your throne, for she is the defense of emperors and especially of Christian emperors, and she will make your reign secure."
- 14 "Be subject to the Lord and also to your lords as to the image of God, in modesty and fear." *Barnabas*, 19, 7.
- 15 The most recent study of this and allied concepts is that of C. Martini, *Ambrosiaster: de auctore, operibus, theologia*, *Spicilegium pontificie athenaeae Antoniana*, IV (Rome, 1944).
- 16 Friedrich Andres, "Die Engel und Dämonenlehre des Klemens von Alexandrien" (Fortsetzung), *Römische Quartalschrift*, XXXIV (1926) pp. 131 ff.; cf. Otto Weinreich, *Antikes Gottmenschen-tum* (1926); L. Bieler, *Theos anēr: Das Bild des göttlichen Menschen im Frühchristentum* (Vienna, 1939); J. Gross, *La divinisation du chrétien d'après des Pères grecs: Contribution historique à la doctrine de la grâce* (Paris, 1938); F. Taeger, "Zur Vergottung des Menschen im Altertum," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, LXI (1942), p. 3.
- 17 Ed. F. X. Funk, ii, 26. The deacon holds the place of Christ, the deaconess that of the Holy Spirit.
- 18 Firmicus was not yet a Christian when he wrote the *Mathesis*, but he probably felt no need of revising his basic views after his conversion. As Kenneth Setton remarks, he was obsessed with the divinity of the emperor in the *Mathesis* and in the *De errore* with his sanctity.
- 19 Exodus 22:28 and Psalm 82:6.
- 20 *Les survivances du culte impérial romain: A propos des rites shintoïstes* (Paris, 1921). Mention is made of such terms as *adoratio, despotes* (replacing *kurios*), *aeternitas, numen, sacer*, etc.
- 21 "The Emperor's Divine Comes," *Journal of Roman Studies*, XXXVII (1947), pp. 102ff. See also Lily Ross Taylor, *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor*, American Philological Association Monographs, No. 1 (Middletown, Conn., 1931). She has shown the extent to which Eastern ideas of the royal soul and glory mingled with indigenous Italian concepts to contribute to the belief in the divinity of the Roman Emperor even during the Principate.
- 22 "Konstantin-Helios," *Hermes*, XXXVI (1901), pp. 457 ff. For a more recent

- discussion see Franz Altheim, *Literatur und Gesellschaft im ausgehenden Altertum*, I (Halle Saale, 1948), esp. pp. 138-144 construing Constantine as a continuator of Aurelian's solar political theology. Eusebius likens Constantine to the sun, *De laude*, iii, 4. For the most recent exploration of the Emperor's exchange of the *Sol invictus* for the *Sol justitiae* (Christ) as celestial patron and antitype, see Ernst H. Kantorowicz, "Dante's 'Two Suns,'" *Semitic and Oriental Studies*, University of California Publications in Semitic Philology, XI, (1951), 217.
- 23 "Mysterium lunae: Ein Beitrag zur Kirchentheologie der Väterzeit," *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, LXIII (1939), "I: Die sterbende Kirche," p. 311, p. 428; "II: Die gebärende Kirche," *ibid.*, LXIV (1940), p. 61; "III: Die strahlende Kirche," *ibid.*, p. 121. Rahner himself does not mention the possible religio-political implications of the imagery. Eventually, of course, the imagery is papalized, the sun being the Papacy and the Empire the moon.
- 24 *Op. cit.*, vii, 3; as edited by Henry G. Meeham (Manchester, 1949), p. 82; discussed by H. Rahner, *op. cit.*, LXIV, p. 126. Firmicus Maternus declared that no astrologer could determine an emperor's fate, for the emperor alone is not subject to the motions of the stars. *Mathesis*, ii, 30, 5.
- 25 "Der Gute Hirte in hellenistischer und frühchristlicher Logotheologie," *Heilige Überlieferungen . . . Ideofons Herwegen dargeboten* (=Beiträge zur Geschichte des alten Mönchtums und des Benediktinerordens: Supplementband), (Münster, 1938). "Das Bild des Guten Hirten in den altchristlichen Baptisterien und in den Taufkirturgen des Ostens und Westens: Das Siegel der Gottesherde," *Pisciculi: Studien zur Religion und Kultur des Altertums* Franz Dölger . . . dargeboten (=Antike und Christentum, Ergänzungsband, I), (Münster, 1939), pp. 220 ff. "Der Gute Hirte in Frühchristlicher Totenkirturgen und Grabeskunst," *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati*, Vol. I. (=Studi e Testi, 121) (Vatican City, 1946), pp. 373 ff.
- 26 Mention may be made here of Hans Leisegang's clear and fascinating demonstration of the relationship between Augustine and Philo by way of Ambrose. "Der Ursprung der Lehre Augustins von der *civitas Dei*," *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, XVI (1926), p. 127. Leisegang indirectly illuminates our field of inquiry in showing the connection between the Logos (= *noëtê polis*) of Philo and the *civitas Dei* (= Bride of Christ, also Body of Christ) in Augustine. The Logos concept, as a rational, orderly, and soteriological principle, being also both *personal* and *corporate* in its implications and attendant imagery, not only encouraged speculation on the relationship between religion and politics but also facilitated the assimilation of the body ecclesiastical to the body politic.
- 27 Hugo Gressmann, the author of *Der Messias* (Göttingen, 1927) in which the Shepherd King is given prominence, brings out the messianic significance of the Logos in his critical edition of the *Theophania*, *Eusebius' Werke*, III (Leipzig, 1904).
- 28 "The Re-emergence of the Arian Controversy," *Anglican Theological Review*, X (1927/8), p. 11. Related to this is Buckler's presidential address before the American Society of Church History, "Barbarian and Greek, and Church History," *Church History*, XI (1942), p. 3.
- 29 For Catholic we could say Orthodox, but we risk confusion with later Greek Orthodoxy. We could say Nicene, but this would be to overlook shifts and accommodations within the Catholic position between Nicaea and Constantinople. We could say Athanasian, but this would be to associate Catholicity too closely with one man, his clerical, regional, and temperamental peculiarities. To be sure, in preferring the designation "Catholic" we risk identification with the Roman West, but since catholicity is most valiantly defended in the fourth century by Rome, certain Western bishops, and Athanasius, supported by Rome, we can afford to err on this side.
- 30 So, Lucifer of Cagliari, pillorying the obsequious Arian bishops in respect to Constantius, *Luciferi Calaritani opuscula*, ed. by Wilhelm Hartel, *C.S.E.L.*, XIV (Vienna, 1886), 311. 25. Hereafter cited by *opusculum*, page, and line. The basic study of Lucifer upon which we shall draw in this study is that of Gustav Krüger, *Lucifer, Bishop von Calaris und das Schisma der Luciferianer* (Leipzig, 1886); the most recent pertinent study appears to be that of Pietro Maria Marcello, *La posizione di Lucifero di Cagliari nelle lotte antiriane del IV secolo*, (Nuoro, 1940), wherein it is maintained that Lucifer did not end up a schismatic with those who assumed his name.
- 31 So, Ambrose of Milan. Altogether there were four possible positions worked out by Christians within the framework of the Empire which had recently been their persecutor. At the beginning of the fourth century the Donatist Puritans, whose schism had also a nationalist source, asked angrily (1): What has the Emperor to do with the Church? In response, Optatus of North Africa replied toward the middle of the century (2): The Church is in the Empire. At the end of the century Ambrose wrote of Theodosius (3): The Emperor is in the Church. At the end of the next century (496) Pope Gelasius, writing when large sections of

the Western Empire had succumbed to the onslaughts of the Barbarians, addressed himself to the Emperor in Constantinople thus (4): There are two things by which this world is chiefly ruled: the sacred authority and the royal power. Each of these four famous phrases might provide us with a slogan or formula for the major positions assumed by Christians after the conversion of Constantine and before the final destruction of the Empire in the West and its complete transformation as the Byzantine Empire in the East. Interestingly the rigoristic Donatist preserves the common Ante-Nicene reserve toward the state, a feeling which survives also among the monastics. In this paper we are chiefly concerned with (2) and (3).

32 Marcellus accommodated himself to the Nicene formulation at the Roman synod of 340, but he remained the target of numerous attacks from all sides. The most recent analysis of his position is that of Wolfgang Gericke, *Marcell von Ancyra: Der Logos Christologe und Biblizist, sein Verhältnis zur antiochenischen Theologie und zum Neuen Testament*, Theologische Arbeiten zur Bibel-, Kirchen- und Geistesgeschichte, X (Halle, 1940).

33 First suggested as a key to the ecclesio-political struggle of the fourth century by Hans-Georg Opitz, "Euseb von Caesarea als Theologe", *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche*, XXXIV (1935), p. 1, especially at the end of the paper.

34 *Historiarum adversus paganos libri septem*, vii, 29.

35 Hendrik Berkhof states well the relationship between Christology and political behavior in the fourth century, contrasting the East and West: Im Westen bedeutete Stellungnahme im arianischen Konflikt zugleich: Stellungnahme gegen den Kaiser, also, Bruch mit der byzantinischen Haltung der Kirche gegenüber dem Kaiser. Wer dort anfang, theologisch zu denken, musste notgedrungen anfangen, politisch zu denken. Darum wurden nicht im Osten, sondern im Westen die neuen theologisch-politischen Begriffe geformt, welche wie *Dynamit* [italics mine] unter dem von Konstantin geschaffenen Verhältnis von Staat und Kirche wirken sollte. *Kerk en Kaiser* (Amsterdam, 1946); translated by Gottfried Locher as *Kirche und Kaiser: Eine Untersuchung der Entstehung der byzantinischen und der theokratischen Staatsauffassung im vierten Jahrhundert* (Zollikon-Zürich, 1947), p. 195. This book, written for the Church and not for the academic community alone, deals with the political implications of the Trinitarian position. Composed after the author had "dived

under" during the Nazi occupation of his native land, it concerns the relation of the Church to the would-be monolithic State, Arian, Aryan, or Asiatic. The present writer is much indebted to Berkhof, though the main lines of his own research had been laid down before Berkhof's book could be procured. Less concerned with the theological dimension of the problem, Kenneth Setton states the ecclesio-political theme of the fourth century in a similar fashion:

In Constantius' insistence . . . upon asserting his authority over the Church *de iure*, seems to me to lie the chief cause of the change in the attitude of Christian churchmen towards Emperor and imperial State after the sixth decade of the fourth century.—

Christian Attitude towards the Emperor in the Fourth Century, Especially as Shown in Addresses to the Emperor, Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, no. 482 (New York, 1941), p. 54.

36 W. Ensslin has recently traced the development of *Dei gratia* in our period without, however, touching upon our theme, "Das Gottesgnadentum des autokratischen Kaisertums der frühbyzantinischen Zeit," *Studi bizantini e neoellenici*, V (1939), 154.

37 The extent of the revision to meet the needs of Constantius' policy against both Nicene Orthodoxy and paganism in the interests of an Arian peace is discussed by J. Maurice in *Bulletin de la Société nationale des antiquaires de France*, 1913, esp. pp. 388, 395 f.

38 For this more radical critique of the *Vita*, see Henri Grégoire, "Eusèbe n'est pas l'auteur de la *Vita Constantini* dans sa forme actuelle et Constantien n'est pas converti en 312," *Byzantion*, XIII (1938), 561. According to him Euzoius reworked the papers of Eusebius inherited by him as bishop of Caesarea (p. 583). For a more moderate view taking into consideration the long history of *Vita*-criticism, we await the forthcoming publication among the Dumbarton Oak Papers of Glanville Downer's exhaustive study based upon fresh MSS and archaeological evidence.

39 "The Political Philosophy of Hellenistic Kingship," *Yale Classical Studies*, I (1928), 55. Goodenough himself went on to show the adaptation of Hellenistic ideas in *The Politics of Philo Judaeus* (New Haven, 1940), ch. iii.

40 "Eusebius and the Christian Empire," *Annuaire de l'Institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales* (=Mélanges Bidez), II (1934), 13. Baynes once again emphasizes the survival of Hellenistic ideas of kingship in his long critique of K. Setton, *op. cit.*, in *Journal of Roman Studies*, XXXIV (1944), 135, and in his

- Bryce Lecture of 1945, *The Hellenistic Civilization and East Rome* (Oxford, 1946).
- 41 *Christomimēsis* is the key concept in a forthcoming publication on Byzantine political theology by my revered teacher Ernst Kantorowicz, now of Princeton, who has valiantly upheld the principle of academic liberty in recently resisting at the University of California the policy of unwitting *echthromimēsis*! Something of his general theory is brought out in connection with his study of the sources of Dante's Two Suns, *loc. cit.*, esp. p. 222 and n. 14.
 - 42 Admirably developed by Gerhard Ladner, "Origin and Significance of the Iconoclastic Controversy," *Medieval Studies*, II (1940), 127.
 - 43 *Die Theologie des Eusebius von Caesarea* (Amsterdam, 1939).
 - 44 The Anomean creed preserved in the *Historia acephala*, ix, is a good specimen of this strand of thought clearly exposed to view as a result of the unraveling of Arianism after 360.
 - 45 Opitz contrasts Athanasius' *De incarnatione* and *Contra Gentes* with Eusebius' Syrian Theophania and draws attention also to the opposing interests of the two bishops as represented by the famous biographies from the pen of each: Athanasius' *Vita Antoni* with its glorification of ascetic withdrawal from the world and Eusebius' *Vita Constantini* with its sanctification of civil society.
 - 46 Eusebius, *Vita*, i, 17.
 - 47 Eusebius, *De laude*, x: *hupophētēs tōū pambasilēōs theōū*. As N. Baynes remarks, pagan emperors had resorted to divination (and he might have added divinization). Now, as a Christian, Constantine might himself be an interpreter by inspiration, "Eusebius and the Empire," p. 15. Cf. Opitz, *op. cit.*, p. 113.
 - 48 Eusebius implies a comparison with Paul (as earlier the victory of Constantine at Saxa Rubra makes him a new Moses leading his people through the Red Sea), but the term *isapostolos* is later. The commemoration of Constantine and Helen as saints (the parallel to Christ and Mary suggests itself) falls in the Eastern calendar on May 21. Cf. *Acta SS Maii*, V:2, 17ff. The adoration of Constantine must have reached extraordinary proportions, perhaps climactically under Constantius. In any event Photius appears to have been particularly horrified as he epitomizes Arian Philostorgius, *H. E.*, ii, 17, describing the vows and supplications offered up, *as to God*, to an image of Constantine upon a porphyry column amidst many lamps and much incense. Cf. also the *Chronicon paschale*, anno 330, P. G, XCII, 709f. See further the commentary of J. Gothofredus, ed., on the law concerning imperial images in the Theodosian Code, *lib. xv, tit. 4, 1*, (vol. v, pp. 390 ff.).
 - 49 In view of the extensive research on the alleged vision of Constantine, it seems quite probable that we have here the effort of Pseudo-Eusebius to legitimize imperial control over the Church. See Jacques Zeiller, who strives to retain at least the authenticity of Lactantius' account of a dream, "Quelques remarques sur la 'vision' de Constantin," *Byzantion*, XIV (1939), 329 and H. Grégoire's reply, "La vision de Constantin 'liquidée'," *ibid.*, p. 341. If then large sections of the *Vita* are to be ascribed to Gregoire's Arian Pseudo-Eusebius or to Maurice's Arian Reviser under Constantius, we have merely to read "emperor" or "Constantius" to get the religio-political force of the eulogy.
 - 50 The modern controversy as to whether Constantine claimed to be bishop of the external affairs of the Church or merely "bishop" of those outside the Church is reviewed by William Seston, "Constantine as a 'Bishop'," *Journal of Roman Studies*, XXXVII (1947), 131. He fails to cite Hendrik Berkhof, "*Ton ektos episkopos*," *Nederlandsch Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis*, XXXIV (1943), 24.
 - 51 *De laude*, vi, 21.
 - 52 *Ibid.*, xvi, 17.
 - 53 In the *Vita* (iv, 48), Eusebius mentions a divine, present at the Arianizing Council of Jerusalem, who in excessive praise of the Emperor declared that Constantine was destined to share the empire of the Son of God in the world to come. Although Constantine rebuked the unnamed ecclesiastic, the latter's words and the scarcely less adulatory phrases of Eusebius' tricennalian oration delivered before an assembly of the very divines who had reconvened after deposing Athanasius at Tyre and now at Jerusalem readmitted Arius to communion, must be regarded as representative of the political thought and atmosphere of the Arianizing camp.
 - 54 *De laude*, ii, 5.
 - 55 *Ibid.*, ii, 6.
 - 56 *Ibid.*, v, 8.
 - 57 *Ibid.*, ii, 6.
 - 58 *Ibid.*
 - 59 *Ibid.*, vii, 12.
 - 60 *Vita*, i, 24. "[All] others have been raised to this distinction by the election of their fellow men . . ."
 - 61 *De Laude*, iii, 5.
 - 62 *Ibid.*, xvi, 7.
 - 63 W. Seston has stated the connection between Arianism and the political convictions of both Constantine and Eusebius: "Je croirais volontiers que, le catholicisme nicéen n'ayant pas réussi sous son règne à ramener à l'unité de la foi les donatistes et les ariens, il [Constantine] lui a très délibérément préféré la théologie d'Arius. Dans le Christ des ariens l'oint du Seigneur, première créature de

- Dieu et modérateur du monde, son panégyriste des *Tricennalia* voit une image de l'empereur de Byzance, dont relèvent tous les hommes et toutes choses." In "Chroniques des études anciennes," *Revue des études anciennes*, XL (1938) pp. 106 f.
64. H. Berkhof, *Kirche und Kaiser*, p. 200.
65. Socrates, *H. E.*, ii, 7.
66. Adolf Lichtenstein, *Eusebius von Nikomeden: Versuch einer Darstellung seiner Persönlichkeit und seines Lebens unter besonderer Berücksichtigung seiner Führerschaft im arianischen Streit* (Halle, 1903), pp. 87-89.
67. Ammianus Marcellinus, *Rerum gestarum*, 22, 9.
68. In the most recent study of Lucian, some advances over Lichtenstein are made in respect to Eusebius but there is nothing further on his political theory. Gustave Bardy, *Recherches sur saint Lucien d'Antioche et son école* (Paris, 1936), livre ii, ch. iii,—"Eusèbe de Nicomédie."
69. Needless to say, Eusebius had to disguise the extremity of his views and make out that he was more or less faithful to Nicaea in leading the Eastern conservatives.
70. Discussed by K. Setton, *op. cit.*, pp. 68-70.
71. Migne, *P. G.*, XXXIII, 1165, Scholarship is not certain whether the recounting of this meteoric spectacle is a) an effort to enhance the status of Constantius by linking him by means of a second heavenly portent with his father or b) a proof that up to 351, at least, the vision of Constantine was unknown and a possible spur to the reading of such an episode into the Arian revision of the *Vita*. Cf. J. Zeiller, *op. cit.*, p. 331.
72. *Liber apologeticus*, Migne, *P. G.* XXX, Coll. 835 ff. But cf. M. Albertz concerning Church and State materials assembled in the unpublished portion of his dissertation cited in his *Untersuchungen über die Schriften des Eunomius* (Wittenberg, 1908). *These* 12, p. 56.
73. See below, p. 63.
74. *Historia acephala*, viii, Jovian is only Catholic by policy. In demanding the worship of "the Most High God and Christ," Julian betrays no acquaintance with the fundamental issues of the controversy.
75. Shown to be Arian by C. F. Turner, *Journal of Theological Studies*, XIII (1911/12), pp. 506 f., against Franz Xavier Funk, *Die Apostolischen Konstitutionen: Eine literar-historische Untersuchung* (Rotterdam, 1891), pp. 97 ff.
76. Edited by F. X. Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, 2 vols. (Paderborn, 1905).
77. *Ibid.*, I, p. 207 (V, 20). This is an expansion of the "Constitutor" not found in the third century *Didascalia*.
78. II Chron. 26. In ii, 27, iii, 10 and viii, 46
- Uzziah is cited as a layman presuming to exercise priestly functions. From the context it is clear that the interest of the "Constitutor" is intra-ecclesiastical. He is guarding against unauthorized acts of lay people and the lower clergy to perform "liturgies" not proper to them.
79. *Ibid.*, iv, 13, vii, 16.
80. *Ibid.*, vi, 24.
81. There is unfortunately no full length study of Constantius, to say nothing of a systematic presentation of his ecclesiopolitical views. Father Francis Dvornik promises a whole chapter devoted to Constantius in his forthcoming comprehensive study of Eastern political theory.
82. Ammianus Marcellinus, *Rerum gestarum*, xxi, 16, 18.
83. His concern for the reunion of the strifed churches for the sake of imperial peace and prosperity comes out very strongly in the words ascribed to him by Lucifer of Cagliari in refuting him. While these phrases cannot be direct quotations in all cases, they are surely a good transcript of his general point of view.
84. Theodoret, *H. E.*, iii, 3. Theodoret is willing to accept Constantius as a Catholic at heart despite his opposition to the *homousion*, but this evaluation comports ill with what we know of Constantius, even from Theodoret.
85. His policy toward paganism is summarized by André Piganiol, *L'Empire chrétien* (Paris, 1947), pp. 96 f.
86. The fullest account of this philosopher and orator is by Willy Stegemann, "Themistius," in Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencyclopädie*, A V:2 (1934), coll. 1642-80. See also Wilhelm von Christ, *et. al.*, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, 6th ed., II; 2 (Munich, 1934), No. 802 and Johannes Straub, *Vom Herrscherideal in der Spätantike, Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Geistesgeschichte*, LXXX (Stuttgart, 1939), pp. 160-175. Glanville Downey has generously allowed me to consult his critical texts and translations.
87. The best text of the *Orationes* is that of Wilhelm Dindorf (Leipzig, 1832), soon however, to be replaced by the critical edition of Prof. Downey. The orations are systematically discussed by Vladimir Valdenberg, "Discours politiques de Themistius dans leur rapport avec l'antiquité," translated from the Russian by H. Grégoire, *Byzantion*, I (1924), p. 36.
88. Dindorf, *op. cit.*, pp. 21-7. A direct reference to Constantius' appreciation of *Oratio* II and his high estimate of Themistius therefore are found in *Oratio* IV, 65, 18 f.
89. Otto Seeck, *Brief des Libanius* (Leipzig, 1906), p. 296. A later Emperor, possibly Julian, erected a second statue in Themistius' honor.
90. For example, Constantius, in response to Themistius' entreaty, returned to Con-

- stantinople its full quota of grain which had been withdrawn in punishment for the lynching of Hermogenes. Constantius made Themistius proconsul in 358/9 and later urged him to become *praefectus urbis*. In 359 he invited Themistius to dine at the imperial table and overwhelmed him with favors up to the very end of his reign. Stegemann, *loc. cit.*, coll. 1647f. The Arian Valens appointed him as tutor of his son Valentinian Galates and Theodosius made him guardian of Arcadius.
- 91 Theodoret, *H. E.*, ii, 13.
- 92 Athanasius, *Historia Arianorum*, 33.
- 93 K. Setton discusses the views of certain publicists and panegryrists in the fourth century, *op. cit.*, pp. 26-31 and chap. vi. "Philosophy before the Throne [Synesius]". See also C. H. Coster, "Synesius, a *Curialis* in the Time of the Emperor Arcadius," *Byzantion*, XVI (1940/1), 10.
- 94 Theodoret, *H. E.*, ii, 13.
- 95 *Oratio* VI.
- 96 *Oratio* I, 3, 12 ff.
- 97 Especially *Oratio* VI, delivered in Constantinople in 364 apropos of Valentinian's taking Valens as co-ruler, but the idea is present in the earlier orations. Cf. Eusebius above, p. 24, n. 6.
- 98 *Oratio* XVIII, pp. 267, 7f. Cf. Eusebius above, p. 24, n. 9.
- 99 *Oratio* VI, pp. 93 f.
- 100 *Oratio* VI, p. 87, 15ff. Cf. the speech of Aurelian to his soldiers noted by Ensslin, *op. cit.*, p. 156, n. 7. Cf. Eusebius above, p. 24, n. 8.
- 101 *Oratio* V, 16, 17. Though pagan in origin the phrase is absorbed into a novel of Justinian, CV, 2, 4. Pointed out by K. Setton, *op. cit.* p. 26.
- 102 See sequel to this article.
- 103 "Assyrians" normally means "Jews." Pauly-Wissowa, s. v.
- 104 *Oratio* VII 89D, p. 167; XI 147C, p. 175; XIX 229 A, p. 278.
- 105 That Themistius directly influenced the Arian Valens is attested by Socrates, *H. E.*, iv, 32 and Sozomen, *H. E.* vi, 36. Here, however, it was the liberty of conscience that was defended by Themistius and thus the effect of the oration was to bring relief to the hard pressed Nicenes. It is Glanville Downey's view that Themistius' revival of pagan cosmopolitical theories was induced by and to a certain extent modelled on the political theologies of Eusebius and other court bishops in an effort to show that pagan philosophy could provide the resources for a comprehensive, tolerant (especially in *Oratio* VI, 80ff.) imperial theology.
- 106 *Op. cit.*, xvi, 10, 9ff. Cf. Themistius, speaking of the good emperor as the statue (*agalma*), the same on earth as God in heaven, *Oratio* I, 10, 3f. The significance of Constantius' god-like demeanor outside Rome and within is discussed by J. Straub, *op. cit.*, iv, "Dominus-Princeps."
- 107 *Op. cit.*, xv, 1, 3; cf. official letter to Lucifer ascribing *aeternitas* to Constantius, *C. S. E. L.*, XIV, 321, 22.
- 108 *Op. cit.*, xv, 8, 9.
- 109 *Ibid.*, xxi, 13, 14.
- 110 The ancient idea of the ruler as *sōtēr* (and as Shepherd of the people *poimēn laōn*, e. g., Themistius, *Oratio* I) undoubtedly facilitated Constantius' assimilation of his role to that of the Christ-Logos.
- 111 *Oratio* XVIII, 263, 6f: The good emperor is a father to the fatherless; *Oratio* III, 51, 2, Constantius is a *theos* on earth like patriarchal Zeus above, the one illuminated by the other; *Oratio* II, 41, 16 and 25, Constantius is likened to "that great leader in heaven" of the gods (Zeus).
- 112 Amminaus, xxi, 14, 2.
- 113 *Op. cit.*, p. 102.
- 114 Ammianus (xxi, 16, 18) mentions with impatience the Emperor's great zeal in calling councils and his participation in the discussion, all unworthy of him from the annalist's point of view.
- 115 One may cite his conduct at Arles, 353, and at Milan, 354, his choice of Euzoios, at the time bishop of Antioch, to baptize him as he lay in *extremis*. Euzoios' recent synod had just promulgated an Anomoean creed frankly calling the Son a creature.
- 116 This is especially clear from the words imputed to him by Lucifer in *De non conveniendo cum haereticis* and from the imperial arguments, based on the old Roman principle of *do ut des*, refuted by Lucifer in *De regibus apostaticis*.
- 117 One is reminded of a modern parallel: Opposition in Nazi Germany to the formation of a *Reichskirche* under the former barracks chaplain, Reichsbischof Müller, came from the conservatives. In war-time Japan the opposition to the Tojo-enforced United Church was from the ecclesiological and christological conservatives.
- 118 Athanasius, *Historia Arianorum*, 33.
- 119 *C. S. E. L.*, LX, 94: "non enim ullas vires habere poterit definitio, cui nostra dogmatis tuae episcopi *episcopum* te copiam denegari."
- 120 *Moriendum esse pro Dei filio*, 311, 24 ff.: "Quid ad haec respondes, Constanti, cui crebro sunt adclamantes Arianæ dogmatis tuae episcopi *episcopum* te esse *episcoporum*, morientes propter deum unicum filium credis an non credis regnum possesuros caelorum?"
- 121 *De non parcendo in Deum delinquentibus*, 267, 19-268, 28.
- 122 *Ibid.*, 268, 13; cf. 62, 17; 80, 5; 143, 30; 160, 26; 162, 3; 201, 17; 220, 16; also 265, 16 f.: "libros scriptos dedisti et praedicatores benigni noti tui omni loco constituisti;" 263, 13.
- 123 It is quite possible that it was Constan-

- tius rather than Constantine who considered himself the Thirteenth Apostle, thus combining pagan and Christian motifs in gaining control as *pontifex maximus* over the episcopate. Especially pertinent here is the paper of Glanville Downey, the substance of which was presented at the Annual Symposium at Dumbarton Oaks, given over in 1949 to the problem of the Church of the Apostles. As a consequence of Downey's research based on fresh MSS and archaeological evidence, considerable alteration will be necessary in the theory advanced by Otto Weinreich, "Konstantin der Grosse als Dreizehnter Apostel und die religionsgeschichtliche Tendenz seiner Grabeskirche," *Triskaidekadische Studien* (Giessen, 1916). But it will at the same time release what is valid in Weinreich's study for application to Arian Constantius and his attempt to control the episcopate from Constantinople. Significantly the translation of the relics of St. Andrew et al. to Constantinople took place during the reign of Constantius, Philostorgius, *H. E.* iii, 2, and the ascertained date of the translation has considerable bearing on our problem as the forthcoming publication of Downey's paper will show.
- 124 See sequel to this article.
- 125 Migne, P. G., XVIII, col. 676D.
- 126 *Ibid.*, col. 680B. Noted by R. V. Sellars, *Eustathius of Antioch and his Place in the early History of Christian Doctrine* (Cambridge, 1928), p. 36. Athanasius says that the Arian *episcopoi* might rather be called *katakopoi* (spies). *Historia Arianorum*, 48 and 75.
- 127 Karl Friedrich Hagel traces the development of Athanasius' religio-political thought in *Kirche und Kaisertum in Lehre und Leben des Athanasius* (Leipzig, 1933). Hagel shows how Athanasius passes from a willing acceptance of the authority of Constantine to ever clearer pronouncements in favor of the independence of the Church. Nor does the accession of the Niene Jovian cause him to reverse his views matured under the persecution of Constantius. The phases distinguished are (i) to 335; (ii) 335 to Sardica, (iii) from the return from the second to the third exile, (iv) the phase following the third exile. Most of the material in the present study concerning the views of Athanasius will be taken from writings or strata therein distinguished by Hagel as belonging to the final phase.
- 128 *Historia Arianorum*, 33; Migne, P. G., XXV, col. 732. Cf. John 19:15.
- 129 *Epistola encyclica*.
- 130 *Historia Arianorum*, 55 ff.; in 74 in summarizing the events of 356 he says that the Arians and Gentiles offered sacrifices in the Great Church and uttered blasphemies against Christ.
- 131 Julian's attempt to erect a philosophically monotheistic church was only the *frankly* pagan analogue of Constantius' unsuccessfully Arianized *Reichskirche*. Themistius in his plea for toleration in *Oratio VI* delivered before the successor of Julian indicates that there was quite a bit of religious accommodation on the part of Christians (Arians?) during Julian's reign.
- 132 *Oratio XVII*, 9; Migne, P. G., XXXV, col. 975. But on the whole it must be admitted that Gregory Nazianzen was, compared to Basil of Caesarea, quite uncritical of the emperor. In his declamations against Julian he was prepared to rehabilitate Constantius as the most divine of emperors and most loving of Christ. *Oratio IV*, 34; Migne, P. G., XXV, col. 560 D. Gregory's position is discussed by K. Setton, *op. cit.*, pp. 104-106.
- 133 Ep. xxi, 13; Migne, P. L. XVI, Cf. Hendrik Berkhof, *Kirche und Staat*, p. 195. The presupposition of Ambrose is that only orthodox worship is pleasing to God, securing his favor for the Empire. Berkhof criticizes him for his intolerance and notes with regret the survival in the Saint of the essentially pagan principles of *do ut des* but rejoices in Ambrose's spokesmanship for the freedom of the Church over against even a Catholic emperor.
- 134 W. Parsons, *op. cit.*, 354.
- 135 Heinrich Schlier, "Mächte und Gewalten im Neuen Testament," *Theologische Blätter*, 1930, col. 289; "Die Beuteilung des Staates im Neuen Testament," *Zwischen den Zeiten*, 1932, p. 312; "Vom Antichrist: Zum 13. Kapitel der Offenbarung Johannis," *Theologische Aufsätze: Festschrift zu Karl Barths 50. Geburtstag*. (1936), p. 110; Günther Dehn, "Engel und Obrigkeit: Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis von Röm. 13, 1-7," *ibid.*, p. 90; Karl Barth, *Evangelische Theologie*, III (1936), p. 413; Karl Ludwig Schmidt, with qualifications, "Das Gegenüber von Kirche und Staat in der Gemeinde des Neuen Testaments," especially Excursus II: "Die Kirche als Beisassenschaft," *Theologische Blätter*, XVI (1937), p. 2; enlarged in *Die Polis in Kirche und Welt: Eine lexicographische und exegetische Studie* (Basel, 1939). The whole theory is opposed by Gerhard Kittel, *Christus und Imperator: Das Urteil der ersten Christenheit über den Staat* (Stuttgart/Berlin, 1939) in "Beilage: Die 'dämonistische' Deutung von *exousia* in Röm. 13, 1ff."
- 136 Lucifer was particularly savage in his epithets, calling Constantius variously *dux et praecursor Antichristi*, 113, 210; 138, 10; 168, 15; etc.; *Antichristus*, 106, 8; 238, 14; 276, 2; *adversarius Dei*, 9, 13; 75, 18; *procurator diaboli*, 174, 6.

THE PERSONALITY OF AMALARIUS

ALLEN CABANISS, *University of Mississippi*

The first fleeting glimpse we have of the shadowy figure of Amalarius¹ is one of him as a youth in the city of Tours at the monastic school of Saint Martin under the careful tuition of Alcuin, the most learned teacher in the Carolingian realm.² The last we hear of him, many years later, is a bitter remark that by his words and books he had infected and corrupted almost all the churches within and beyond France and that his writings should have been destroyed after his death.³ Both the date and the place of the beginning and the end of his life are unknown, and even his full name is uncertain—some have called him Amalarius Fortunatus; others, Symphosius Amalarius. Yet this man, whom J.-K. Huysmans called "the most ancient of the liturgists,"⁴ played a vital role in the busy years of the first half of the ninth century.

Although the bitter, vengeful imprecations of Deacon Florus of Lyons pursued Amalarius relentlessly, even beyond the grave, it was Amalarius who belonged to the future, not his detractors. His works were copied and studied in his own lifetime, summarized and interpolated by generations of medieval commentators, and subjected to minute and critical scrutiny by modern liturgists and liturgical historians. Even today, in little devotional manuals on the Mass, we still find allegorical interpretations that are lineal descendants of Amalarius's fancies. Three centuries after Amalarius, the Englishman, William of Malmesbury, wrote only the truth when he observed, "For encyclopedic information about the liturgy you will look in vain for another like Amalarius. There may perchance be one who has written more elegantly, but certainly none more learnedly."⁵

While he was still living, Amalarius himself supervised the large-scale multiplication of his works in the *scriptorium* of Lyons for distribution among all the parish churches of that diocese.⁶ Upon some of them, he saw that loving care was expended to make the volumes ornate, causing the very bindings to be sewn with silken threads.⁷ Even his enemies testified that his writings had spread rapidly throughout the churches of Gaul and into some of the surrounding regions.⁸ The teachings of Amalarius quickly became traditional. Passing by Berno of Reichenau and Bernold of Constance, Rupert of Deutz and Durand of Mende, all of whom made extensive use of Amalarian ma-

terial, it will be sufficient to direct special attention only to Honorius of Autun, the twelfth-century author of *Gemma Animae*, a popular devotional and mystical treatise on the liturgy.⁹ Without our modern sense of shame, Honorius copied verbatim passage after passage from Amalarius's books without acknowledgement, the most singular quotation being the very phrase that was condemned as heretical at Kiersy, namely, the assertion that the body of Christ is tripartite or triform. Of recent scholarly concern for the ninth-century liturgist, the 114-page study by Father Hansens, extending over a period of three years (1933-1935) in *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, bears eloquent testimony to the abiding interest that is provoked by an author who lived more than eleven hundred years ago.¹⁰

Basically Amalarius was an artist with an artist's failings and virtues. That proposition may be amply demonstrated if we analyze our knowledge of him in terms of several categories which seem usually to characterize an artist. First, a high degree of subjectivity. In spite of the conventional modesty of referring to himself as "my littleness"¹¹ and the equally conventional humility of asking his superiors to correct his works,¹² Amalarius's most typical attitude was expressed by his words, "I have not suffered the restraining influence of fearing any master, but giving thanks to my God, I have written what I have felt."¹³ The entire *corpus* of his extant works is filled with iteration of the first personal pronoun and his own personal experiences, so much so indeed that his adversary, Deacon Florus, accused him of "raising his horns in a boastful and insolent manner."¹⁴ "I heard . . .," Amalarius repeated many times, "I asked . . . I read . . . I wrote . . . I went . . ."

It is not a great leap from such exalted subjectivity to cocksureness and pride. Try as he did to derive authority for all of his teachings from the Fathers, it proved somewhat difficult to do so; "meanwhile," he stated, "I say what I think."¹⁵ When Amalarius undertook to revise the antiphonary, he gave as an excuse the boredom that he had long experienced because of the diversity of usage and the necessity which he felt impelling him to attempt to secure a scrupulous uniformity throughout his province.¹⁶ Again and again he cited as references his own previous treatises, especially the *Liber Officialis*, of which he was perhaps inordinately proud.¹⁷ But cocksureness, like a shield, has another side, which appears in Amalarius's sensitivity. At the inauguration of his literary activity, we find a note of something akin to timidity, a fear of ridicule. Although he said that he wrote only what seemed right and honorable, he begged his friend, Abbot Peter of Nonantola, not to let some of the earlier tracts come to the view of the general public lest Amalarius be subjected to the raucous laughter of critics.¹⁸ Much later he sought desperately to defend himself against those carping detractors who thought his teachings were

dangerous,¹⁹ as well as against a precocious and impertinent youth who challenged the propriety of some of Amalarius's actions at Mass.²⁰

Subjectivity, pride, and sensitivity imply individualism, a phase of the artistic temperament which was strong in Amalarius. All of the references hitherto cited indicate his individualism, but a few more passages may be noted. The clearest illustration lies in his devotion to Roman standards of worship. Amalarius was determined to follow Roman leadership and went to great lengths to secure Roman models. Yet when he came, for instance, to the preparation of his antiphonary, he was unable to resist the temptation occasionally to make use of the antiphons of the church of Metz, as well as apologetically to employ some of his own compositions.²¹ He confessed that while he was a young student he remained dutiful and responsive to the authority of his teacher (Alcuin), but that afterward he asserted his independence and celebrated his liberation by doing what seemed to his own mind to be advisable.²² Unwilling to go along the path of the conventional practice of the Frankish churches, he wanted to make innovations—love of novelty was the aspect of his character to which his enemies took the greatest exception.²³ He sought, as he said, the old and beaten track, and he was aflame with love of antiquity, but they were both of his own deliberate choice, not the result of custom;²⁴ he was a traditionalist, but one who preferred to exercise his individuality in choosing the particular tradition of his allegiance.

Perhaps the most conspicuous ingredient in Amalarius's constitution was his vivid and colorful imagination. He was indebted to no previous author for his brilliant conception of the Mass as a dramatic action or for his acute perception of the great beauty of those liturgical gems, the Advent or "O" antiphons. His ability, or more accurately his attempt, to enter the minds of the composers of the Divine Office required an unusual flight of fancy, but that is precisely what Amalarius aspired to do.²⁵ A strikingly imaginative use was made of his experiences on the sea. First, they inspired his *Versus Marini*; then, they served to introduce the letters to Peter of Nonantola and Hilduin; later, they appear as the substructure of a short parable he related to illustrate the difference between the Alleluia of the Mass and the Tract; and still later, about a quarter of a century after the event, they provide him with a figure of speech to describe his discovery of an old Roman antiphonary at Corbie.²⁶ His feeling that his great treatise came to him as a ray of light piercing the darkness of a crypt where he was languishing is almost Bunyanesque in quality.²⁷

From his gift of imagination there emerged a certain adventure-someness of spirit. Like John Scotus Erigena, Amalarius did not shrink from speaking and writing what he felt, although he knew it might provoke controversy. Secure in his own belief, he recorded

his thoughts and pressed others to accept them, not even hesitating to add his own compositions to the liturgy or to rearrange passages of the service as he deemed suitable.²⁸ His enemies leaped at this seeming presumption to discredit him.²⁹ Perhaps the most surprising bit of derring-do was his plunge into the strife over Gottschalk on the side of the amazing Erigena.

Another characteristic which marked Amalarius as an artist was his originality. Allegory itself was not new to him; he probably learned the method from the Venerable Bede through Alcuin. However, one does not have to learn allegory; it is apparently natural to the human mind. Certainly it was present in the Biblical, Patristic, and Classical literature with which Amalarius was familiar. But, except for one Greek and one Latin antecedent, both unknown to him, Amalarius was the first Westerner to apply the allegorical method to the Divine Service. Although he was an erudite scholar, he was keenly aware of his originality; when he was at last brought to trial and was questioned about the source from which he derived his teachings, his reply under oath was simply, "Out of my spirit."³⁰ From the beginning of his career as a literary figure to the very end, he claimed the immediate inspiration of God for his beliefs and assertions. Abbot Peter recognized it in 814 when he asked Amalarius for a book, "which," he said, "you set forth under the direction of the Holy Spirit."³¹ And shortly before the condemnatory council of Kiersy, almost twenty-five years later, Amalarius himself declared that his interpretations in the *Liber Officialis* were revealed to him by Christ.³² The claim of inspiration cannot be more drastically stated, unless we accept as true Florus's remark that Amalarius had dared to compare his antiphonary with the Apocalypse of Saint John the Divine.³³

In spite of such insistence, however, Amalarius possessed an inquiring mind. Ceaselessly learning by query and study, he wore out his welcome at Rome by his intellectual curiosity concerning the liturgy. Pope Gregory IV became so annoyed by the interrogations that he assigned to him the learned Archdeacon Theodore, who was, in his turn, irked by the tireless questioner.³⁴ Amalarius's mental alertness appears all the more striking when we realize that he was from fifty to fifty-five years of age when this particular inquiry was undertaken and from sixty to sixty-five years old when the results of the research were recorded. Part of Amalarius's scholarship was his perfectionist ideal, his constant and enduring search for more light and more knowledge. With prodigious industry he produced not only eighteen books, but also four editions of his *magnum opus* (*Liber Officialis*), each edition the result of full revision of previous material as well as the addition of new matter. So vast indeed and so fresh was the fund of information that he gathered, collated, and published that his books,

especially the *Liber Officialis*, became an undiminishing storehouse of liturgical knowledge for all later medieval scholars who wrote on that subject.

If an artist is one who is characterized by a high degree of self-awareness and subjectivity, a sense of pride in his work, sensitive feelings, conscious individuality, intuitive imagination, a spirit of adventure, fresh originality, warmth of inspiration, a mind open to new learning, and a striving for perfection, then Amalarius was an artist. These characteristics are not completely clear-cut categories—they do overlap at many points—but surely even a cursory mention of them justifies our description of Amalarius.

To an incredible extent, Amalarius lived in a world of his own, high above the tumults of his time and unaffected by its "passing parade." In order to understand that proposition more clearly, we should first remind ourselves that he was a courtier. Favorably regarded by Charlemagne and Louis the Pious, he was, for twenty years and more, called upon to serve as a "trouble-shooter" in situations demanding either skillful diplomacy or outstanding scholarly attainments. And, in spite of his single specialized interest, the liturgy, he seems always to have been unusually willing to perform with care and devotion any task which served his emperor. It is barely possible that he may have been for a short time a part of the palace household, perhaps a functionary in the palatine school. His association with Chancellor Helisachar may suggest that,³⁵ as also may his subtle but reiterated allusions to the superiority of Hebrew to all other tongues, although he knew nothing about that language.³⁶ The praise of Hebrew may have been his means of acquiescing in the palace favor toward the Jews of Frankland and a diffident answer to the rising tide of antisemitism among the critics of the court. A veiled intimation of his familiarity with the court is his very guarded disapproval of mimes and *histriones*,³⁷ whose presence in imperial circles may have been a far-fetched reason for stressing the dramatic quality of the Mass, just as Tertullian, six centuries earlier, had already suggested that if the people needed *spectacula* they might find them in the service of the church.³⁸

However much of a courtier Amalarius was, it remains true that he was almost entirely oblivious to his physical environment. (Even his observation that June was the month for mating and for wars was merely a conventional statement already time-worn.) One of the most significant features of his writings, covering the span of years from 810 to 840, is a total absence of any reference to the world-shaking events of his lifetime. Not from Amalarius do we learn anything about the *divisio imperii* of 817 and the revolt which it inspired, the disturbing influence of the Empress Judith, the humiliating penance imposed upon Louis at Attigny in 822, the fraternal re-

bellions of 830 and 833, the apostasy of Bodo to Judaism, the battle of Fontenoy, the treaty of Verdun—events which set the Carolingian world agog. Nor did he manifest the interest in folklore and local history that his contemporary, Bishop Agobard of Lyons, displayed. Palpably honest, he was unable to temper his thoughts and beliefs to the every-day world, as appears so patently in his brusque answer to the young cleric who criticized him, an answer not calculated to soothe the detractor, "You said that you have seen no other priest do as I did. . . . When I heard you say that, I first decided to make no reply . . . ,but later changed my mind so that you might not remain in the error of your ignorance. . . . You are still just a child and you have not seen many priests. . . ." ³⁹ This statement indicates far less tact than Calvin's method of dealing with the old woman who disapproved of his wearing the black Genevan gown—the Reformer simply walked away despairing of any success in convincing her of prejudice.⁴⁰ Still more clearly does Amalarius's unrealistic evaluation of his contemporaries appear in his futile attempt to persuade the unruly and obstinate clergy of Lyons to his allegorical approach to the liturgy.⁴¹ Even his proven unorthodoxy did not restrain him from writing and publishing another, his last book, *De Ordine Antiphonarii*, or from entering the theological lists against poor Gottschalk. His calm, unperturbable equanimity, or, as it must have seemed to those who did not like him, his sluggish, apathetic complacency, serenely rode out every storm; in part, it was this very composure which aroused the frantic, almost fanatical, opposition of his foes.⁴²

Possessed then of an artistic temperament and free from the partisanship that divided the Frankish realm, Amalarius may be not inaptly described as one of the tribe of "wandering scholars" without their more glaring vices and indeed without much of their glamor. He was a scholar—that we have already shown, but he was also a wanderer, in fact the worst of wanderers, an *episcopus vagans*. After having been a student at Tours, bishop of Trèves, dedicatory of a church at Hamburg, consecrator of a bishop at Toul, Amalarius was sent as an imperial emissary on a journey to Constantinople. On the voyage he visited Zara, Durazzo, and Aegina. Returning, he stopped for a moment at Nonantola, then hastened to Aix-la-Chapelle. Later meanderings carried him to Paris, Rome, Corbie, Thionville, Lyons, Kiersy, and Metz, always studying, always learning. This restlessness too was a source of some of the criticism hurled against him by Deacon Florus.⁴³

Trying his hand at versification, but not becoming a real poet, Amalarius, like the more famous *Vagantes*, did as he pleased, or, as he said, "I wrote what I felt." Free of spirit like others of his kind, he fell, like many of them, into heresy, because, like them, he was a "masterless man." Even his feeling for nature was akin to that ex-

pressed by the scholarly lyrists of the *Carmina Burana*. And finally, like most of the *Vagantes*, he achieved something which is not precisely anonymity, but which closely approximates it: after his death under the dark cloud of heterodoxy, the name and fame of Amalarius was perpetuated through his writings, but exactly who the man Amalarius was is a question the answer of which was soon lost or forgotten.⁴⁴

In sum, we may concur in the dictum of Dom Morin that Amalarius was "one of the most original personalities of the Carolingian epoch."⁴⁵

1. Together with M. L. W. Laistner, *Thought and Letters in Western Europe A. D. 500 to 900* (London: Methuen, 1391), p. 357, n. 2, and M. Manitius, *Geschichte der Lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters* (Munich: Beck, 1911), I, pp. 396-401, I shall make the reasonable assumption that Amalarius, archbishop of Trèves, and Amalarius, author of *De Ecclesiasticis Officiis* (*Liber Officialis*) and *De Ordine Antiphonarii*, are one and the same person. Although the opposite contention has been made and generally accepted since the seventeenth century, I believe that the arguments advanced by G. Morin, "La Question des Deux Amalaires," *Revue Bénédictine*, VIII (1891), pp. 433-442, are cogent. Yet since Morin's article appeared, Rudolf Sahre, "Der Liturgiker Amalarius," *Programm des Gymnasiums zum heiligen Kreuz in Dresden* (Dresden: Lehmann, 1893) pp. iii-iii, Reinhard Mönchemeyer, *Amalar von Metz: Sein Leben und Seine Schriften* (Münster: Schöningh, 1893), and Adolph Franz, *Die Messe im Deutschen Mittelalter* (Freiburg. i/B: Herder, 1902), have continued to deny the identification. It would seem from the index of Bernhard Simson, *Jahrbücher des fränkischen Reichs unter Ludwig dem Frommen* (Leipzig: Duncker-Humblot, 1874-1876), II, p. 307, and the places there cited, that Simson believed that there were three men in this period named Amalarius!
2. Amalarius, *De Ordine Antiphonarii*, ch. lviii, J.-P. Migne, *Patrologiae Cursus Completus: Series Latina*, (hereafter cited as P. L.) cv, 1303C; *ibid.*, lvii, P. L. cv, 1307B; *ibid.*, ch. xvi, P. L. cv, 1271D; also his *De Ecclesiasticis Officiis* (*Liber Officialis*), Book IV, ch. xvii, P. L. cv., 1198A.
3. *De Tribus Epistolis* (among the works of Remigius of Lyons, but probably written by Florus of Lyons), ch. xl, PL, cxxi, 1054C.
4. J.-K. Huysmans, *Là-Bas*, ch. ix near the beginning.
5. William of Malmesbury, *Abbreviatio Amalarii*, ad fin., PL, clxxix, 177A.
6. Florus, *Opuscula Adversus Amalarium*, I, ch. 2, PL, cxix, 73C. *Ibid.*, II, ch. 4, PL, cxix, 81A.
7. *Ibid.*, I, ch. 2, PL, cxix, 73D.
8. *De Tribus Epistolis*, ch. xl, PL, cxxi, 1054C.
9. Honorius, *Gemma Animae* 4 books, PL, clxxii, 543-738. It is curious to note that Amalarius used the word *gemma* twice in his letter to Hilduin, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Epistolae Karolini Aevi* (hereafter cited as MGH:EppKA) III, p. 254.
10. J. M. Hanssens, "Le Texte du 'Liber Officialis' d'Amalaire," *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, XLVII (1933), pp. 113-125, 225-424, 493-505; XLVIII (1934), pp. 66-79, 223-232, 549-569; XLIX (1935), pp. 413-435.
11. Letter to Hilduin, MGH:EppKA, III, p. 249; *De Ecclesiasticis Officiis* (*Liber Officialis*), praefatio, PL, cv, 985C; and elsewhere.
12. Letter to Hilduin, MGH:EppKA, III, p. 251; *De Ecclesiasticis Officiis* (*Liber Officialis*), praefatio, PL, cv, 986C; and elsewhere.
13. *De Ecclesiasticis Officiis* (*Liber Officialis*), praefatio, PL, cv, 986C: "... non frenum passus sum timoris alicujus magistri, sed illico meo gratias agens Deo, scripsi quod sensi."
14. Florus, *Opuscula Adversus Amalarium*, I, ch. 7, PL, cxix, 76C: "... sed tunc jactantius et insolentius cornua erigens ..."
15. *De Ecclesiasticis Officiis* (*Liber Officialis*), praefatio altera, PL, cv, 988 f.: "In omnibus quae scribo, suspensor viro- rum sanctorum atque piorum patrum judicio: interim dico quae sentio."
16. *De Ordine Antiphonarii*, prologus, PL, cv, 1243A.
17. *Ibid.*, ch. vi, PL, cv, 1257B, and numerous other places in *De Ordine Antiphonarii*.
18. Letter to Peter, PL, xcix, 891C: "... ne intret in dentes obtreccatorum neque cachinnis superborum ..."
19. *De Ecclesiasticis Officiis* (*Liber Officialis*), praefatio, PL, cv, 987B: "... periculose scripsissem ..."

- 20 Letter to Guntard, *PL*, cv, 1336-1339.
- 21 *De Ordine Antiphonarii, prologus, PL*, cv, 1244A; ch. xxiv, *PL*, cv, 1278C.
- 22 *Ibid.*, ch. lviii, *PL*, cv, 1303C.
- 23 Florus, *Opuscula Adversus Amalarium*, I, ch. 7, *PL*, cxix, 76A; Agobard, *De Correctione Antiphonarii*, ch. ii, *PL*, civ, 330C: "... omnia humana figmenta ..."
- 24 Letter to Hilduin, *MGH:EppKA*, III, p. 251; *De Ecclesiasticis Officiis (Liber Officialis)*, *Continentia causae scriptiois secururae, PL*, cv, 992D.
- 25 *De Ecclesiasticis Officiis (Liber officialis)*, praefatio, *PL*, cv, 987B; *ibid.*, *Continentia causae scriptiois secururae, PL*, cv, 992D: "... quid in corde esset primorum dictatorum officii nostri ..."
- 26 *Versus Martini, Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini* (hereafter cited as *MGH:PLAC*), I, pp. 426-428; letter to Peter, *PL*, xcix, 890-892; letter to Hilduin, *MGH:EppKA*, III, pp. 247-257; *De Ecclesiasticis Officiis (Liber Officialis)*, I, ch. xxxviii, *PL*, cv, 1069C; *De Ordine Antiphonarii, prologus, PL*, cv, 1243A.
- 27 *De Ecclesiasticis Officiis (Liber Officialis)*, praefatio, *PL*, cv, 985C.
- 28 *De Ordine Antiphonarii*, ch. xxix, *PL*, cv, 1281AB.
- 29 Agobard, *De Divina Psalmodia, passim, PL*, civ, 325-330; Florus, *Opuscula Adversus Amalarium*, II, ch. 22, *PL*, cxix, 93D.
- 30 Florus, *Opuscula Adversus Amalarium*, II, ch. 6, *PL*, cxix, 82A.
- 31 Peter to Amalarium, *PL*, xcix, 890B.
- 32 *De Ecclesiasticis Officiis (Liber Officialis)*, IV, ch. xlvii, *PL*, cv, 1242C.
- 33 Florus, *Opuscula Adversus Amalarium*, II, ch. 6, *PL*, cxix, 81C.
- 34 *De Ordine Antiphonarii, prologue, PL*, cv, 1245 f.
- 35 *Ibid.*, *PL*, cv, 1244B.
- 36 *De Ecclesiasticis Officiis (Liber Officialis)*, I, ch. i, *PL*, cv, 996A; *ibid.*, ch. xxi, *PL*, cv, 1057C; *ibid.*, ch. xxxii, *PL*, cv, 1059A; *ibid.*, IV, ch. ii, *PL*, cv, 1167C.
- 37 *De Caerimoniis Baptismi, PL*, xcix, 898B.
- 38 See, for example, Tertullian, *De Spectaculis*, chh. 4, 26, 29, 30, and *Apologeticus*, ch. 15. See also E. K. Chambers, *The Medieval Stage*, I (Oxford University Press, 1903; impression of 1925), p. 11.
- 39 Letter to Guntard, *PL*, cv, 1336 f.
- 40 See the material cited in W. D. Maxwell, *John Knox's Genevan Service Book 1556* (London: Oliver and Boyd, 1931), p. 210.
- 41 Florus, *Opuscula Adversus Amalarium*, III, *PL*, cxix, 95 f.; I, ch. 2, *PL*, cxix, 73B-D; II, ch. 4, *PL*, cxix, 80 f.
- 42 Florus uses such epithets for Amalarium as *vulnus putridum, impudens audacia, sordida mens, praevaricator, auctor inauditi execrandique erroris, dementissimus*; Agobard's repertory includes *stultus et improbus, calumniator, contentiosus et pertinax, philosophus, vagus et furibundus*.
- 43 Florus, *Opuscula Adversus Amalarium*, I, ch. 7, *PL*, cxix, 76C.
- 44 Many of the manuscripts of Amalarium's *Liber Officialis* bear his name with widely divergent titles, such as monk, abbot, priest, Roman arch-deacon, bishop, archbishop, and *chorepiscopus*. The 10th-century *Gesta Treverorum* refers to him as a Roman cardinal as well as archbishop of Trèves; Honorius of Autun mentions him as bishop of Metz; and Ademar of Chabannes calls him only a deacon!
- 45 Morin, *op. cit.*, p. 442.

ADDITIONAL NOTE: Although J. M. Hanssen's *OMNIA OPERA AMALARI LITURGICA*, 3 vols. (Studie testi, Vols. 138-140) (Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1948) came to me too late to be used in the preparation of this paper, I find that none of my statements or conclusions needs to be changed.

THE MERCERSBURG THEOLOGY—ITS PURPOSE AND PRINCIPLES

GEORGE W. RICHARDS, *Lancaster, Pa.*

In the century from 1750 to 1850, to use a phrase of Whitehead, there was a change in the "climate of opinion" in the Western World. Men ventured upon new paths with new methods of investigation and new tests of reality. A score of epoch-making books appeared between Rousseau's *Social Contract* and *Emile*, 1762, on the one hand, and Comte's *Positive Philosophy*, 1853, and Spencer's earliest writings on the other. John Fiske said: "In their mental habits, in their methods of inquiry and in the data at their command, the men of the present day who have fully kept pace with the scientific movements are separated from the men whose education ended in 1830 by an immeasurably wider gulf than has ever divided one progressive generation of men from their predecessors." This change of viewpoint and method of approach to reality involved both intellectual disintegration and theological reconstruction.

I

The professors in the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in the United States, then located at Mercersburg, Pa., were among the first theologians in America who clearly discerned the theological issues of a new age and understood Professor Dorner when he wrote: "The *theological problem* as yet left unsolved by the Reformation, namely, *the scientific union of the material and the formal*, of the subjective and objective principles, is only a concrete expression with reference to the Christian religion, of the *philosophical problem* of the union of subject and object, of thought and existence."¹ In the orthodoxy of the seventeenth century the gospel was petrified; it had become a dogma to be accepted without personal experience of its content. Against this kind of authoritarianism men revolted in the form of Romanticism, Rationalism, Pietism, and Mysticism. Each of these movements sought to find approval in the reason, the will, or the feeling, of the objective facts of Christianity, or of existence in general. The rationalistic supernaturalism and the pietism which prevailed in the churches of Europe and America no longer satisfied the modern man. The gospel was in process of dissolution.

Dr. Schaff wrote: "Dissatisfaction with existing institutions in the Old World is growing; and through vehement birth throes a

new order of life is gradually coming."² The consequence, to use the words of Dorner, was that an "antiquated theology went down to its grave but the *Christian Faith* remained, nay, was even now reviving with fresh vigor, to bring forth in due time a new theology. To this result philosophy, even in its specially critical period, furnished its contribution."³ It became clear to the evangelical theologians of Germany that a complete revolution in the view of the world was necessary before there could be new life and true progress in theology.

We owe to rationalism the recognition that, "Religious truth shall not be set before the subjective spirit in the form of mere outward authority but become fully reconciled to it in an inward way in the form of conviction and certainty." Account had to be taken of certain just demands, such as the right of the individual reason and conscience as over against the established authority of church and state; the legitimacy of criticism as over against implicit faith; and the cry for forms of life corresponding to the experience of a new age.⁴

II

After Dr. Rauch's death, 1841, Dr. Nevin and Dr. Schaff were confronted by practical issues, arising out of American Protestantism. Dr. Gerhart, who was one of the first students at Mercersburg and later a colleague of his professors, said of Dr. Nevin: "As a result of his studies and his own observation, he was convinced that the churches of the Reformation, transplanted to American soil, had, in great measure, given up their original faith, had come under the power of a spirit foreign to the Reformation symbols, and were really, unwelcome as was the charge, drifting on the broad current of rationalism. The German Reformed Church with others, . . . had also, in a great degree, forsaken its own original denominational character, and subjected, in the absence of counteracting force sufficiently strong, to the power of Puritan and Methodistic modes of thought, was rapidly undergoing a transformation into the image of a foreign system."⁵

This conviction became the master-light of the theologians of Mercersburg, the theme of all their writing. They felt it to be their mission to protest against erroneous doctrines and practices in the American churches from Catholicism to Unitarianism, including Puritanism, Methodism, and Anabaptism. This they did from the new vantage ground which they professed to have won through a mastery of the evangelical theology of Germany, which dated its rise and spread from the national struggle for independence against the usurpation of Napoleon, the enthusiasm of the celebration of the third centennial of the Reformation, 1817, the proclamation of the Evangelical Union in Prussia, and the influence of the idealistic philosophy

of Kant, Schelling, Hegel, Schleiermacher and the mediational theologians of that generation.

The compelling motive was to revive the piety and the theology of the Reformation. Witness Schaff, *Das Prinzip des Protestantismus* and *What is Church History?—A Vindication of Historical Development*; Nevin, *The Anxious Bench*, *The History and Genius of the Heidelberg Catechism*, *The Mystical Presence*, *The Anti-Christ*, *The Sect and Spirit of Schism*, and the articles in the *Mercersburg Review* from 1849 on. They emphasized the objective, sacramental, and liturgical factors in opposition to the subjective, revivalistic, and rationalistic elements which were congenial to pioneers on the frontier of a new world. In his *Tract On the Revised Liturgy*, (76 and 79), Nevin writes: "The Gospel of Puritanism substitutes for all this a construction of Christianity that is purely subjective, centering in the human mind, and that gives us notions for facts, causing metaphysical abstractions to stand for the proper objects of faith, and thus resolves all religion finally into mere spiritualism; in which no account is made of any objective mediation of grace outside of men, but every man is supposed to come directly, face to face, with God, and having in his evangelical notions simply whatever is necessary to give him free access to the Divine presence."

If we were to quote a single sentence from the writings of Dr. Nevin which controlled his theological thinking, we could do no better than to choose a statement made in his "Eulogy of Prof. Rauch": "Faith must embrace, not the *notion of supernatural things simply*, but the *very power and presence* of the things themselves. The invisible was felt to be truly actual and real, while the outward and visible might be regarded as being in some sort only its empty shadow projected on the field of space." On this point Rauch the philosopher and Nevin the theologian agreed—both agreed with Schelling and Hegel, to whom "*Denknotwendigkeit ist Seinsnotwendigkeit*."

III

New Measurism, with the anxious bench at the center, Dr. Nevin regarded as a composite of Puritanism and Methodism, spawning sects and schisms for more than half a century. He therefore wrote his first tract, entitled, "The Anxious Bench," in which he exposed its errors and proposed Christian nurture instead of revival rupture as the normal way of developing the Christian life.

Dr. Schaff, in his "The Principle of Protestantism," called attention to the defects of supernaturalistic orthodoxy and also warned the church against a false and uncontrolled subjectivism. "Rationalism and secetarianism," he says, "are the most dangerous enemies of our church at the present time. They are both but different sides of the same principle, a one-sided false subjectivity sundered from

the authority of the objective. Rationalism is theoretic sectism; sectism is practical rationalism."

The remedy for these "diseases of Protestantism," or of "pseudo-Protestantism," was sought both in a restoration and in a completion of the evangelical ideas of the Reformation. Dr. Schaff wrote in 1845: "The Reformation must be regarded as still incomplete. It needs yet its concluding act to unite what was fallen asunder, to bring the subjective to a reconciliation with the objective." For both the Catholic and evangelical churches were suffering from one-sidedness and incompleteness. The latter emphasized the subjective and experimental in religion to the neglect of the objective and sacramental; the former reversed the emphasis and ignored the personal element in religion. The fatal source of error was their defective Christology or the want of a proper conception of the Incarnation as affecting an organic union of the natural and the supernatural in a new operation continuing in the historical church to the end of time. The restoration was to be not a mere replica of the formulas and institutions of the fourth or the sixteenth century, but a reproduction under new conditions of the normal relation of the believer to Christ, of faith to the Bible, of freedom to authority, of the individual to the Church, as these were realized in the experience of the Reformers. The completion of the Reformation was not to be a breach with evangelical principles but an advance beyond the position of the original Reformers, beyond confessionalism and rationalism by the acceptance and application of truth new and old to the solution of problems in church and state. Moreover, it was fondly hoped that there might be also a reconciliation of Catholicism and Protestantism in such a way that "the truth that each includes may be saved in the union of both," resulting in what was termed "Protestant-Catholicism." It was to be reconciliation, not by concession, but by advance of both types of Christianity to a higher plane. Thus neither reaction nor revolution—neither Romanism, Puseyism, rationalism nor sectarianism—but the progressive development of Christianity in the bosom of the world's life was the hope of the men of Mercersburg.

When Prof. Tholuck (Halle) was walking with Dr. Henry B. Smith, he exclaimed: "Do you know the controlling and central feature of the theological thought of the day? It is *Ent-wick-el-ung* (development)," emphasizing each syllable as he answered his own question.⁶

The Mercersburg men were mediationalist, *Vermittelungs Theologen*, not merely in their purpose to reconcile the different churches—Catholic and Protestant—but also in attempting to harmonize dogmas with the conclusions of philosophy, and religion with culture by putting old truths into new forms. They recognized the right of reason by giving it not a creative but a formative function in relation

to revelation and religion. They made room for emotion in the Christian life, without yielding to fanaticism, by regarding feeling as a "child of truth and the parent of duty." Their spirit was voiced by the slogan which Schaff popularized in America. "In essentials, unity; in the doubtful points, freedom; in all things love."

"Dr. Nevin always assumed and said that the subjective element of man's nature, the free and ethical side of the personal creature had, likewise, its God-given rights, and that violence to the inalienable claim, come from whatever quarter it may, however sovereign or holy, is destructive of all human advancement."

All contradictions that have perplexed men were reconciled in Jesus Christ—the opposition between God and man, authority and freedom, spirit and matter, revelation and science, the objective and the subjective factors in the religious life. The rival denominations, even Roman Catholicism and Evangelicalism, it was hoped, would in time become Protestant Catholicism. One can discern at this point the influence of the Hegelian triad; thesis, antithesis, synthesis, which lent itself to their theory of historical development.

Union is to be effected in men, not by compromise and diplomatic bartering, not by sacramental magic or by logical or theological argument, but by mystic fellowship, *unio mystica*, of believers with Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord. They favored reconciliation not by compromise or concession but by advancement to a higher form of Christian life and thought. Thus in an organic and progressive way the benefits of the Incarnation are communicated to the race and the Kingdom of God is gradually realized in the hearts and lives of men.

Ephesians 2:14: "For he is our peace, who has made us both one, and has broken down the dividing wall of hostilities." Colossians 1:19: "For in him all the fullness of God was pleased to dwell, and through him to reconcile to himself all things, whether on earth or in heaven, making peace by the blood of the cross."

IV

The reason for the critical attitude of the teachers at Mercersburg toward the churches and toward theological and scientific thought, and at the same time for their spirit of conciliation and their hope of progress to a higher form of Christianity than had yet been attained, is to be found in the central position which they gave in their thought and life to Jesus Christ. They were Christological, not Bibliological, in their thinking, and from their Christology all other articles of faith were deduced as by vital and logical necessity. A restatement of the several Christian doctrines naturally followed.

In the Incarnation, the Son of God assumed fallen human nature, thus sanctifying it into real, organic, and eternal union with himself. The glorified humanity of Christ continues to be the only

medium of gracious communication from God to mankind, and of all real approach of man to God, and fellowship with him.

From this theory of the person and work of Christ logically followed the conception of the Church as being the organic continuation of the divine-human life of Christ in time for the salvation of men; of the Holy Ghost as the bearer, through all ages, of Christ, the true life, and as the condition of the helpless sinner participating in His grace; of the sacraments as the organs of the Church, or means of grace, by which men are made partakers of the life of Christ; of regeneration as the inception by divine power of the new life in the act of transition from the state of fallen nature to the sphere of the new creation; of conversion as the voluntary act of the conscious subject, acknowledging and submitting, in contrition of heart, to the authority of the spiritual kingdom in which he was brought by baptism; of justification as the act of God by which the believing sinner is made righteous in Christ; of worship as the common act of the congregation of believers offering themselves, in union with Christ's glorious merits, on the altar of the gospel, in sacramental acts, in confession, prayer, and praise; of hades as an imperfect state, intermediate between death and the resurrection; and of the resurrection as the consummation of the regenerated life in the triumph of the entire man, soul and body, over sin and all the powers of darkness.

V

It is clear that the Mercersburg men stood for a new interpretation of Protestantism. They differed, therefore, not only from one or another of the denominations, but from American Protestantism as a whole. This fact accounts for the controversies which followed the utterances of Nevin and Schaff, inside and outside of the Reformed Church, on this side and on the other side of the Atlantic. Every fundamental doctrine in their theology was attacked. Dr. Charles Hodge, in his review of Dr. Nevin's *Mystical Presence*, charged Nevin with borrowing "cast-off clothes of Schleiermacher" and "a rag here and there perhaps of Hegel." Dr. Nevin acknowledged with lasting gratitude his debt to "the English and Germans, both to Princeton and Berlin," to Schleiermacher who influenced more or less, with his thinking, all the evangelical thought of Germany. He left behind him "a vast number of prolific ideas which have taken root in other minds and shot up in different spiritual creations." He mentions Neander, Nitzsch, Julius Müller, Dorner, Richard Rothe, Ullman, Umbreit, etc. "All these men feel the genial influence of Schleiermacher though in very different ways."⁸ On page seven of the Preface to *Anti-Christ*, he disclaims, however, the guilt of following the errors either of Schleiermacher or Hegel, notwithstanding the help he has received from their writings.

Dr. Hodge based his charge against Nevin upon two controlling principles in the *Mystical Presence* and the "Anti-Christ or the Spirit of Sect and Schism": first, he makes the person of Christ the ultimate fact of Christianity rather than his doctrine or his work; secondly, the supernatural life, which this included, is represented as coming through Him into organic union with the life of nature for the redemption of the world.⁹

Nevin claimed that the person of Christ gives every article in the Apostles' Creed its full significance; nor does it deny the orthodox idea of atonement, imputation, justification, the agency of the Spirit, but only provides for them a suitable basis in the deep Christological reality, which lies beyond. It neither rejects the doctrine of Christ nor his work, but merely resolves their value into the constitution of his life.

From this point of view he criticises Lutheranism, Calvinism, Arminianism, Anabaptism, and Methodism on the one hand; Romanism, Anglicanism, and Puseyism on the other. He and Schaff recognized the truth in all of these groups; yet they rose above and beyond them in their conception of Christ and the Church. They differed from the Puritan and Methodist churches in emphasizing the objective element in the work of redemption as that is embodied for men in the historic Church. They differed from the Anglican and Roman churches in emphasizing the Church as an organism of which Christ is the head and heart, instead of an institution mediating externally and mechanically between God in heaven and men on earth. In their theological thinking they were guided by analogies from the organic and the ethical order, not from the mechanical and forensic. They held the divinity and humanity of Christ together and found man's access to God and God's way of approach to man through Christ's glorified humanity, in the Church, his Body.

VI

The system was not merely historical. While the originators were profound historical scholars and were deeply versed in the whole history of the Church, their design was not a restoration of the theology of the fathers, the schoolmen, or the Reformers. The principle of historical development brought them into sympathetic touch with the theologies, liturgies, and usages of all ages, but would not permit them to return to Rome, Geneva, Wittenberg, or Oxford. Nevin was possessed by the indestructible conviction that the solution of the great questions of history, in church and state, is not found by return to a past order, but by advancement into a new order. Rome performed a great mission in the Middle Age. The Teutonic nations, however, have reared the standards of Protestantism and under it have won the hegemony of the West. Neither the one nor the other is the final form of Christianity. Yet both, Romanism and Protestantism

ism, will contribute their portion to the Church that is to be. Nevin believed that God, through the Incarnation, in a distinctive form, is in history, and that in His own time and in His own way the nations will become the kingdom of the Christ.

Dr. Nevin, more than any man in the Mercersburg School, passed through a profound struggle of mind and heart. True, he had faith in the organic and historical nature of the Christian Church and in its progressive mastery of the sinful world by way of development; but with the vision of a prophet dimly seeing a new order rising out of the contemporary situation, and unable to define its form and substance, he shared Cardinal Newman's prayer, for the "kindly light" to break through the "encircling gloom."

In a sermon before a synod of the Reformed Church he compared the situation of Protestantism to that of the Israelites, when pursued by Pharaoh's hosts. As then, so now, the duty of the hour is to stand still and wait for the salvation of the Lord. He was dissatisfied with Protestantism; he could not find peace by going to Rome. So he put his trust in God to guide the Church universal forward and upward into a higher and better order.

VII

The opponents of the Mercersburg men, especially of Dr. Nevin, found abundant material in their writings for indictments against their orthodoxy and their trustworthiness as religious leaders. The help received from the German speculative philosophers from Kant to Hegel was the ground for the charge of Germanizing. The Christological idea of the mediational theologians was the ground for the charge of Lutheranizing. The high regard for the sacraments and ordinances and the Christian ministry was the ground for the charge of Anglicizing. The restoration of the ancient creeds in their relation to the modern church, the emphasis on objective authority in the Church, rather than on the private judgment of the individual, and the theory of the essential unity and continuity of the church, were the grounds for the charge of Romanizing. True, some zealous disciples, who lacked the balance and vision of the masters, went to Rome and to Oxford. But those who have comprehended the full significance of the Mercersburg movement have remained with the leaders, in sympathy indeed with the Church catholic, and yet unable to find a more congenial home in the bosom of any other ecclesiastical household than in the Church of their fathers.

In reply to the charge of Germanizing, Nevin wrote: "We honor German learning and thought, and stand largely indebted to them for such views as we have come to have, of men and the world, of Christianity and the Bible. We are not of that class of men who pique themselves on being good philosophers because they have never read a line of Kant and have not the remotest conception of what was

dreamed by Fichte and Schelling; or who consider themselves safe theologians because their dogmatic slumbers have never been for a moment disturbed by Schleiermacher or by the dangerous school of Tübingen. We confess our obligations both to the philosophy and the theologians of Germany."

In the next paragraph he declares his independence of German theology. "With all this high opinion, however, of the German mind and learning, we belong to no German school and have never pretended to follow strictly any German system or scheme of thought. Neither have we been blind at all or insensible to the dangers of a too free or too truthful communication with these foreign forms of thinking. . . . Theory and speculation have been with us subordinate always to the idea of positive Christianity, as an objective of faith exhibited to us in the Bible and in the history of the living Church."¹⁰

The difference between Dr. Nevin and Professor Dorner, a master of the Mediationists, came to view in the idea of the church, ordination and the Christian ministry. On this point Dr. Nevin says: "Here we reach what we feel to be surer and more solid ground than any such Christological studies of themselves furnish; and just because these studies seem too often to stop short of what is involved for faith in the full apprehension of the Christian mystery, as a continuous presence in the world, they are found to be at certain points more or less unsatisfactory in the end to our religious feeling. Here it is that, with all our respect for German divinity, we consciously come to break with it in our thoughts, and feel the necessity of supplementing it with the more practical way of looking at Christianity which we find embodied in the ancient creeds. In this respect we freely admit our theology is more Anglican than German. We stand upon the old creeds. We believe in the Holy Catholic Church."¹¹

In the sixteenth chapter of Nevin's "My Own Life," he discussed his *Historical Awakening* and his first contact with the Oxford movement (coming events casting their shadows before them). He wrote: "And yet my first glimpse, perhaps, of what the church spirit means, came to me unexpectedly (he was then 27 years of age) from looking into a volume of the *Oxford Tracts*, which a friend had bought, found it tiresome reading and then passed, as a psychological curiosity, into my hands. I was not converted in any sense to the views of the book. But I saw (what I had not believed before) that there was deep intelligent conviction at work in the Oxford Movement; that the men concerned in it were neither fools, nor visionaries, nor hypocrites; and there flashed upon me, at the same time, some sense of the profound religious problem, which they were wrestling with, and in their way endeavoring to solve. That was all. But where I then stood, in the way of seed thought, this was much."¹²

VIII

Twenty-five years after the heat of controversy at Mercersburg cooled off, Dr. Schaff, living and laboring in New York, said in retrospect:

"The Mercersburg theology was chiefly due to the writings and personal influence of Nevin. . . ." His own, that is, Dr. Schaff's studies, however, furnished the safe historical basis for its progress. He summarized the leading tenets of the Mercersburg theology as follows:

"The person of Christ is the central doctrine of theology as it is the central fact of revelation; the law of historical development must be predicated of sacred history, since the Church is an organism; the Lord's Supper is more than a mere commemorative celebration, . . . to these doctrinal tenets were added a liturgical form of worship, the recognition of the church year, and the practice of catechetical instruction."¹³

The approval of this last proposal by the Synod of Baltimore (minutes of 1852, p. 93) was the *casus belli* of a 30 years' war in the Reformed Church which threatened a schism that was prevented by a peace commission appointed by the district synods at the direction of the General Synod of 1878. Through the *Order of Worship* of 1866, the implications of the Mercersburg theology were brought into the pews and an uprising followed, not only among ministers but among members throughout the whole Reformed Church.

The nearest parallel to this movement appears to have been in the Lutheran Church.

The one side was led by the very distinguished professor, the Rev. S. S. Schmucker, D.D., who presented the views of one group in the Lutheran Church in a volume entitled, *The American Lutheran Church*, 1852, and in many of his other writings.

The other side was led by the Rev. W. J. Mann, D.D., then pastor of the German Evangelical Lutheran Church, of St. Michael's and Zion's congregations in Philadelphia. He published a volume entitled, *Lutheranism in America*, 1857, an irenic critique of the party represented by Dr. Schmucker. Mann and Schaff were friends, both attended the gymnasium at Stuttgart, slept in the Mann home, and collaborated as scholars in America. Mann, however, did not accept Schaff's theory of historical development without seriously modifying it. He limited it to those matters "that are not finally determined in the Scriptures;" one may call them the *adiaphora*. On this point he differed from Dr. Schaff, also from the extreme left wing, and the extreme right wing, of the Lutherans in America. He represented the "center."

IX

The influence of the Mercersburg School enabled one of its

descendants in the fourth decade of the twentieth century to write without citation for heresy, the following paragraphs:

"The Reformed Church is progressively evangelical. It is free from ecclesiastical shibboleths, because it has learned to distinguish between the essentials and the incidentals of Christianity and is not bound to a specific mode of baptism, to a dogma of the real presence in the Lord's Supper, to a theory of Episcopal succession, to the doctrine of verbal inspiration or to a prescribed method of conversion. True, it believes in baptism, in the efficacy of the sacraments, in the historical continuity of the Church and its ministry, in the inspiration of the Scriptures, and in the necessity of conversion; but the essence of Christianity is not found in anyone, or in all, of these doctrines and practices. There is only one article of faith that may be called the 'article of the standing and falling Church' and that is the conviction expressed in the statement: 'I believe that Jesus Christ is my Savior and Lord.' When and where men have that faith and the life growing out of the faith, there is the Church of Christ, built upon a rock, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

"The Reformed Church in the United States is as liberal as the Gospel and as conservative as the Christ. It welcomes the discoveries of science and the truths of philosophy, and earnestly strives to reconstruct theology in the light of a new age. While it believes that Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, today, and forever, it none the less insists that His Gospel must always be related to the thought and the life of the age in which it is proclaimed. The Gospel, therefore, is unchangeable, but theology, or the scientific interpretation of the Gospel, is constantly changing. It welcomes the results of Biblical criticism, both in the Old and in the New Testament, for it does not rest its faith upon a book, but upon the living Christ who is revealed in the Book. Only that in the Old Testament, which is in harmony with the spirit of Jesus Christ the Lord, is accepted as final authority; and only that in the New Testament, which agrees with the Gospel of our Lord, has permanent value. Our faith, then, rests not upon a collection of books, or a theory of inspiration, but upon the living God as manifested through His Son, Jesus Christ, whose words and deeds are recorded and expounded in the New Testament.

"Creeds and confessions are laudable attempts to set forth and clarify, in concise statements, the objects of faith, but they are always subject to revision when new aspects of the Gospel are revealed by the Spirit of Truth in the heart and mind of the fellowship of believers—the Church."

The issues raised by the Mercersburg School, and the controversies which followed, are similar, not in form but in substance, to the controversies resulting in sects and schisms from the time of the apostles, in the ancient Catholic Church, in the Orthodox and the Roman

Catholic Church, in the Church of the Middle Age, and in the Reformation and the centuries that followed. The primary cause of division was the answers to the questions: "What must I do to be saved?" and "Whom say you that I am?"—Soteriology and Christology. The real significance of the Mercersburg theology, developed by three young men in an obscure village and in a comparatively small and unknown church, can be comprehended only in the perspective of the Christian Church of nineteen centuries.

X

To show that Schaff and Nevin were far-sighted men who had at least a spark of prophecy in their theology, I shall briefly summarize statements made at Oxford and Edinburgh in 1937.

In preparation for the Oxford Conference for Life and Work, Visser 'tHooft wrote: "What we have discovered is that we do not know yet fully what the Church is and what we must try to learn is what is its nature and function." The need of this discovery is constantly reiterated in the writings relating to the ecumenical movement. A hundred years ago Dr. Nevin wrote: "Of all themes the most momentous at this time is the true idea of the Church." Dr. Schaff supported Dr. Nevin: "The main question of our time is concerning the nature of the Church itself, in its relation to the world and to single Christians."

The following paragraph taken from Dr. Nevin's sermon on "Catholic Unity" (1844), would have served as an illuminating footnote to the Report of Section Two of the Edinburgh Conference, 1937, "The Church of Christ and the Word of God". Nevin said, "The Church is not a mere aggregation or collection of different individuals drawn together by similarity of interests and wants. . . The Church does not rest upon its members, but the members rest upon the Church. Individual Christianity is not something older than general Christianity, but the general in this case goes before the particular and rules and conditions all its manifestations. . . . We are not Christians, each one by himself and for himself, but we become such through the Church. Christ lives in his people by the life which fills his body, and the Church; and they are then all necessarily one before they can be many."

Canon Fremantle, in the Bampton Lectures (1883), on "The World as the Subject of Redemption," became the prophet of the much-vaunted social gospel of the present generation. Without knowing it, he expanded in an epoch-making book theses 57 and 58 of Dr. Schaff,¹⁴ "The secular interests, sciences, arts, governments, and social life have become since the Reformation always more and more dissociated from the church. . . . This is a false position since the idea of the kingdom of God requires that all divinely constituted

forms and spheres of life should be brought to serve Him, in the most intimate alliance with religion, that God may be all in all."

Let it be granted, then, that the Mercersburg system has "had its day and ceased to be." Yet an eminent theological professor of New England, "who seldom, if ever, said a foolish thing, missed the mark when he expressed the pious wish that German theology be sunk in the middle of the Atlantic." He reminds one of a genteel Episcopal bishop, who, having had his fill of the glory of the Pilgrims, regretted that instead of the Pilgrims landing on Plymouth Rock, Plymouth Rock had not landed on the Pilgrims—that was the time when ecumenicity was not yet born.

Many of the principles and ideals of Mercersburg have survived and have made the transition to later positions natural and easy. The idealistic view of the world, with emphasis on divine immanence, the conception of the universe as an organism, the genetic relation of nature and history, the recognition of the principle of development of all forms of life, the primacy of the generic in the life of the individual, and the objectivity and reality of universal concepts—these ideas still live and move in current thought and have a formative influence on theology.

Enough, however, has been cited to show the mediational function of this school. Wherever its principles found acceptance, whether through Mercersburg, Andover, Cambridge or New Haven, there the advance from a fixed to a progressive orthodoxy was made without violent conflict. The transition was an evolution and not a revolution. But where the new Protestantism was grafted directly on the stem of supernaturalism, it either has been cast off as a foreign substance, or has become a heterogeneous and spurious growth. If, then, Mercersburg Theology was a comparatively small factor in the process of reconciliation between German and American thought and life, and between the old Protestantism and the new, the lives and labors of great men, in an obscure mountain village, were not spent for naught.

XI

Let us remember that the dialectical school has dealt a solar-plexus blow to the theory of historical development. According to Barth, so far as the kingdom of God is concerned, the theory of progressive development is a figment of the imagination. On this point Thurneysen wrote, in *Zwischen den Zeiten*, (1931): "The ascent of humanity toward the kingdom of God, thought of as a pilgrimage (*Wanderung*) to a higher stage, this thought we no longer entertain, at least if we have become wise (*klug*). To be sure men everywhere have not yet become wise. For example, in America, they continue to dream and speak of this ascent toward a final goal within the process of history."

The eschatological interpretation of the Kingdom of God in many, if not most of the theological circles in Europe, has superseded the historical. The conception of the Church as an organism mediating salvation through sacramental channels, *gratia infusa*, instead of *favor dei* proclaimed as good news, Nevin acknowledges to have received from Anglican sources,¹⁵ not from German theologians nor from the writings of the original reformers of Reformed Protestantism. The fact is we are now living in a world that is almost as different from the world of Nevin and Schaff as theirs differed from the world of Paul and John. While Jesus Christ is the same, yesterday, to-day, and forever, the interpretation of his life and work must always be made in relation to the contemporary order.

I shall close with the last two of the 112 "Theses for the Time" attached to Dr. Schaff's Inaugural:

111. What we most need now, is *theoretically*, a thorough, intellectual theology, scientifically free as well as decidedly believing, together with a genuine sense for history; and *practically*, a determination to hold fast the patrimony of our fathers, and to go forward joyfully at the same time in the way in which God's Spirit by providential signs may lead, with a proper humble subordination of all we do for our own denomination to the general interest of the One Universal Church.

112. The ultimate sure scope of the Church, towards which the inmost wish and most earnest prayer of all her true friends continually tend, is that perfect and glorious unity, the desire of which may be said to constitute the burden of our Lord's last, memorable, intercessory Prayer.

1 Isaac A. Dorner, *History of Protestant Theology, Particularly in Germany* (Edinburgh, 1871) II, 347.

2 *Der Kirchenfreund*, I, 25.

3 Dorner, *History of Protestant Theology*, II, 345-6.

4 Schaff, *What is Church History?* 15.

5 *Bibliotheca Sacra*, LXXVII (1920), 33.

6 Schaff's *Life* by his son, 1839, p. 31.

7 See Dr. Reily's article on Nevin, *Magazine of Christian Literature*, Sept. 1891, pp. 324-326.

8 Preface to Nevin, *Anti-Christ or The Spirit of Sect and Schism* (1848), p. 4.

9 *Princeton Repertory*, 1848, No. II *The Mystical Presence* pp. 207-227.

10 "Anti-Christ," Preface, III-V.

11 *Mercersburg Review*, Oct. 1867, p. 632.

12 *Reformed Church Messenger*, June 15, 1870.

13 David S. Schaff, *The Life of Philip Schaff*, p. 217.

14 "Theses for the Time," appended to the English translation of Schaff's, *The Principle of Protestantism* (1845), pp. 177-190.

15 *Mercersburg Review*, Oct. 1867, p. 632.

PERSECUTION OF THE HUGUENOTS IN THE 18TH CENTURY

SHELBY T. McCLOY,¹ *University of Kentucky*

I.

In 1685 the government of Louis XIV revoked the vestiges of the Edict of Nantes, after having made various encroachments on it since the 1630's when Richelieu nullified the military provisions. And thus France, which under Henry IV in the late sixteenth century had gone farther toward legal toleration than the other states of Europe, lapsed into the ranks of those intolerant. The Edict had never been popular with a large element of the French people, notably the group which had fought under the Guises in the Wars of Religion. The clergy in particular urged its repeal. Louis XIII and Louis XIV under the influence of his Jesuit advisors, Pères Le Tellier and La Chaise, and of his second wife, Madame de Maintenon, a zealous ex-Protestant, revoked the Edict completely.

The Revocation inaugurated a century of persecution and hatred for France, and brought only fragmentary success for Louis' scheme. It is doubtful that Louis, who in many respects was a fair-minded and humane ruler, anticipated fully the unfortunate consequences of this Revocation. In support of this fact, it is to be observed that adult Protestants were not forced to adopt Catholicism but might continue to worship privately as they wished. They might not, however, under severe penalties, participate in public worship, and they must rear their children as Catholics. Thus, according to Louis' plan, Protestantism would gradually and quietly pass out of existence with the current adult generation, and once again, as prior to the Reformation, France would be exclusively Catholic, save for its province of Alsace. In Alsace, which had been added piecemeal by treaty to France in 1648 and 1678, Louis had agreed to recognize the rights of Lutheranism and Calvinism to exist unmolested, and these treaty rights were observed with slight deviations down to the time of the French Revolution.

Louis expected his subjects to obey in the Revocation as in other matters, for his was supposedly an absolute monarchy. But the French people of the 1600's and 1700's were in many respects very individualistic, and the student of French history of that period is surprised at the popular defiance of royal orders. Laws against begging were almost completely ignored, and ordinances issued at

the time of the Plague of Provence (1720) and during the great cattle epizootics (1714-15, 1745, and 1774-75) met much the same fate. Louis might well have realized that on the matter of religion he was more apt to meet defiance than on any other, for Christianity boasted a history of defiance to authority from its origin and the region of France most steeped in Protestantism had also been steeped in the heresies of Arianism, Albigenianism, and Waldensianism long before Calvinism made its appearance. Whether he anticipated trouble or not, he attached penalties for violation, and in accordance with the times they were very severe. Death by breaking at the wheel, a horrible mode of execution in which the victim's body was mangled by an executioner with an iron bar in eleven places and the torso suspended aloft on a cart-wheel for some hours, was ordered for all preachers caught in the act of conducting assemblies (public religious services). Life sentence to the galleys was ordered for all men caught attending such a service, and for the women shaving of the head and life sentence to a convent. Parents who neglected to send their children to the priest or to school for study of the Catholic catechism were to be subjected to a heavy fine. In the face of such drastic penalties, it might readily have been expected that any opposition would vanish.

The result, as well known, was otherwise. The first display of Protestant reaction was emigration on a very large scale. Some emigration, in fact, had taken place in the early 1680's in anticipation of the Act, but after 1685 it swelled into large proportions and so continued well into the first decade of the 1700's. Thereafter, though greatly checked, emigration continued to trickle for three or four decades. Widely varying estimates of the total number of émigrés have been given, from fifty thousand to four hundred thousand. Since no census statistics were kept at that time, it is impossible to arrive at the exact number. Doubtless one hundred thousand would be a conservative estimate. They came from all walks of life, from nobility to peasantry, but more especially from the artisan or industrial class, and their departure had a crippling effect upon many French regions. To halt this emigration, Louis XIV quickly announced that all Protestants caught in the act of leaving France would be sentenced to life imprisonment unless they embraced Catholicism, the men to the galleys, the women to the convents. Their property, moreover, as well as the property of any Protestants who succeeded in escaping to foreign soil, would be subject to confiscation by the crown, to be sold or otherwise used for the Catholic missionary effort among Protestants. Guides caught aiding Protestants in their flight likewise were to be subjected to heavy penalty (death or the galleys), while government awards were promised to informants. These severe penalties did exert a deterring effect, and but for them

the number of Protestants fleeing to other countries might well have doubled or tripled, since France in the 1700's contained as many as a million Protestants. Some have estimated that at the time of the Revolution there were as many as two millions, in a population of twenty-five millions.

Many were sent to the galleys for attempting to escape across the frontiers and for attendance at Protestant assemblies. In June, 1686, 600 Protestants were serving in the French galleys; in 1688, 373 (certain of whom were Swiss and British); in 1714, 168 (after 136 had been released earlier that year). By the middle of the 1700's the number had dropped very much lower, due to increase of toleration and the slackening of emigration.² The emigration was made singly or in small groups, with the women frequently dressed as men. A group of five men and five women disguised as men were arrested near Namur, Belgium, in 1701, by Spanish authorities after they had escaped from France.³ Dutch guides commonly escorted them across the frontier, even going to the region of Bordeaux to get their wards.⁴ The records of the court at Tournai, in French Flanders, show that twenty-five cases came before it in which guides were arrested. When convicted, they were sentenced either to death or the galleys.⁵ Protestants in southeast France generally attempted to escape to Switzerland or Britain, those in southwestern France and in the provinces further north to escape into the Dutch provinces.⁶ A graphic account of a frustrated attempt of three well-to-do youths from Guyenne to escape across the Belgian frontier, of the trial and abjuration of Protestantism by two of them, and of the thirteen years of service in the galleys by the third, is given by Jean Marteilhe (1684-1777) in a book entitled *Mémoires d'un protestant condamné aux galères de France pour cause de religion*, first published about 1758 and many times republished, both in French and in English translation. Its English translator and editor was none other than Oliver Goldsmith. Throughout the latter half of the eighteenth century and down to the twentieth century the little book has served as one of inspiration to Protestant readers, as a treatise of religious heroism. It is a factual account relating the author's experiences and impressions, and terminates with the story of his eventual release after intercession by the British government. The work portrays the writer's opulent background and the efforts of his parents to obtain his release at the outset, the lack of courage shown by those arrested with him, the interest of wealthy Protestant bankers of Paris and Normandy in his case, a minute description of the galleys and of the galley slaves, a picture of the hopelessness that faced those convicted, of the friendship between Turks and Protestants in the galleys, and of the wish of the Protestants for capture by the British warships that hove into sight on more than one occasion during the War of

the Spanish Succession. On his release he was allowed to go to Geneva. One would imagine that he must have been a worn-out man at that time, so rigorous was the training and the life of the galleys, and yet he lived to reach the surprising age of ninety-three. Evidently he was, as he claimed to be, of remarkable physique and endurance.

Not a few of those arrested fleeing the kingdom embraced Catholicism rather than face a life sentence to the galleys, and of those that were sent to the galleys a fair percentage embraced conversion as a way out. One student who has delved into the matter discovered that out of a group of 373 Protestants convicted to the galleys eighty-five abjured their faith in order to escape. In another group, convicted in 1713, the percentage of abjurations was higher. In other groups the number was very small.⁷ Of the Protestants that abjured, many later made their way to Geneva and abjured their abjurations.⁸ One such was Daniel Roucoulet, of Milhau in Vivaret, who after serving six years in the galleys embraced Catholicism and received pardon. Later he fled to Geneva and was restored to the Protestant fold.⁹

In some instances French officials punished the family of those who escaped abroad. A notable instance of this sort occurred in 1745, when a fine of 6000 livres was imposed upon Etienne Gide, a manufacturer at Lassin, Languedoc, after his daughter Anne had escaped from France by what we call the "underground system" and joined relatives at Magdeburg. The charge against him was that he had sent his daughter away. He wrote his brother Théophile at Magdeburg to send his daughter back to France. This Théophile was reluctant to do, insisting that because of the war then existing (the War of the Austrian Succession) it was not possible. He was shocked at the French resorting to fines to compel their young people to return home. Etienne then got his brother-in-law Rey in Paris to bring to bear what influence he could to get the fine reduced. The Maréchale de Grammont thereupon wrote a letter to Saint-Florentin, the minister of state with jurisdiction in the matter, asking him, but without effect, to have mercy on Gide. Théophile Gide, on his part, asked the assistance of the Prussian minister in Paris, De Chambrier, who wrote a letter to Lenain, intendant of Languedoc, asking mercy. He stated that the girl had gone abroad without her father's permission, and that current conditions in Europe made it impossible for her to return. At length on May 30, 1747, the minister Saint-Florentin wrote a friend of the family in Paris, that the fine would be reduced to 200 livres when the girl came home. He stated that the intendant had made this reduction and, though he did not approve of it, he would let it stand. To save her father from this heavy fine, Anne decided to return home, and arrived in August of that year provided with a French passport issued by the ambassador in Berlin.

When the trouble had been settled, she escaped again, going to Geneva, where she married and apparently lived thereafter. We can hardly admire the father, who apparently could have paid the fine and left the girl at large in Prussia. Much more reprehensible was the action of the French minister in imposing the fine.¹⁰

In the southeastern part of France was the small principality of Orange, like an island, belonging until 1714 to the ruling family of the Netherlands and being the territory upon which the title of that family was based. During the wars of the League of Augsburg (1688-97) and Spanish Succession (1702-13), Louis XIV seized it, and though he was forced to return it by the Treaty of Ryswick (1697), he was able to retain it by the Treaty of Utrecht (1713). Orange in the late 1600's was a land of refuge for the Protestants. Determined to alter this condition, Louis in 1697 passed some very drastic legislation, ordering the death penalty for Protestants fleeing there to live, marry, attend college, or baptize their children. Even for trading with the principality without government permission Protestants were to be sentenced, men to the galleys for life and women to prison for five years, and fined 3000 livres. These laws were in effect in 1702 when Louis seized the territory a second time.¹¹ The two thousand Protestants of the principality fled from it in 1703, and in 1712 petitioned the Powers meeting at Utrecht to arrange a settlement whereby they could return; but it was not arranged. It illustrates the severity with which the government of Louis XIV dealt with the Protestant Question, and it is to be observed that Louis was even harsher on the Protestants of Orange than on those of France proper, where an adult was not molested in his religion unless in sickness a curé offered him the sacrament and he refused. On his recovery, his property might be confiscated and he himself banished from the kingdom. In the case that his property was located where it could not be confiscated, a fine equal at least to half the value of the property might be assessed on him.¹²

The penalty for conducting a Protestant religious service was more severe than that for exile. The clergyman was to be executed by breaking at the wheel or by hanging, and it is not clear why the difference in mode of execution was made. A score or two were so executed, the larger number it would appear by hanging. Thus in 1702 a preacher called Petit Marc was hanged before the church near Garrigues de Vauvert, in Languedoc, for conducting a religious service in which five hundred people had participated,¹³ and in 1766 two clergymen in Dauphiné, named Desnoyers and Colombe, were condemned to be hanged and strangled.¹⁴ The attendance at these "assemblies," as they were called, was often very large, not infrequently several thousand being present. I have read of one service in which six thousand persons were reputedly present.¹⁵ These open-

air assemblies, reminding one of the early Methodist services and the American camp-meetings, which in certain respects they anticipated, were necessitated by the fact that all the Protestant "temples" had been confiscated or destroyed. As late as 1757, when the Protestants of certain regions in Languedoc began to rebuild their temples, in the belief that the days of persecution had ended, soldiers were sent by the intendant to order the workmen to demolish what they had erected.¹⁶

At the outset the Revocation was very disconcerting to the Protestants, who in their gloom feared that Protestantism in France might be doomed. Hence the desire to emigrate, or at least to get out their children. As time passed they came to the realization that they could continue to exist in France, though as a stigmatized and persecuted race—a race without the rights of citizenship. At no time did preaching cease, though it appears that the majority of the Huguenot clergy did leave France in the years immediately following the Revocation. Thus, even in the 1690's and the early 1700's we read of Protestant clergymen being seized and executed for conducting assemblies. Gradually they gained the courage to organize their work. The leader in this was Antoine Court (1695-1760), a man of remarkable ability. He reorganized the synod of France in a truly "underground system," insisted that the illegal assemblies (known as "Churches of the Desert") must continue, and provided that young theological graduates from the seminary of Lausanne which he founded with foreign aid would come as pastors to these "churches" for a period of apprenticeship, after which they might retire to Switzerland or other Protestant countries for well-earned repose at pastoral work. Many French Protestants did not agree with Court, and considered him a fanatic. The distinguished exiled pastor at Rotterdam, Jacques Basnage, wrote a pastoral letter to the French Protestants condemning this work and asking them not to oppose the French government. It was written in 1719, and entitled *Instruction pastorale aux Réformés de France sur la persévérance dans la foi et la fidélité pour le souverain*. The government realized its propaganda value and distributed copies gratis over France. Another opponent of Court was the exiled Protestant clergyman and former priest, De Claris-Florian, living in England with Abbadie. In the North of France, save in some parts of Lower Normandy, the assemblies were rarely employed, and in these regions difficulties of Protestants with the government were greatly less than in the regions where defiance was expressed through the assemblies.

In the opinion of one recent scholar these "Assemblies of the Desert" saved Protestantism in France.¹⁷ They were illegal, open-air gatherings of fanatics in the hills or the woods of South France. Their members were representative of the mountain folk of this

country. Government defiance with them took the form of attending forbidden religious meetings and singing with gusto the Psalms of David to the musical notes of Marot. Instrumental music had not yet come into Calvinist acceptance. These Protestants journeyed for miles to attend service and sit on the hard ground. In that same region today, where Protestants may meet legally when and how they wish, attendance is lax.¹⁸ How will one explain this curious contrast?

In the North of France it was possible for Protestants to make occasional trips to Paris and attend services in the chapels of the Dutch, the British, and the Swedish embassies. The Dutch in particular catered to this clientele, having always a chaplain who spoke French well, and arranging for two Sunday morning services so as to provide seating for all wishing to attend. An interesting account of her visit to the Dutch chapel in 1773 has been left by a Madame Le Clerc, in a letter to her brother Louis Du Ry at Cassel.¹⁹

In anticipation of modern "underground" methods, the Protestant clergy in France went by assumed names, avoided residence in towns as much as possible, slept during the day and engaged in pastoral work at night. A Swiss clergyman visiting in France in the latter half of the eighteenth century was given a letter by the pastor in Nîmes to the pastor in another city and had much difficulty in finding his man. No one knew the person addressed until the bearer chanced upon a Protestant who took him to a home where a religious service was being held, led by the pastor in question. The Protestants were intensely loyal to their clergy and very deferential. In this respect Milton might well have written of the eighteenth-century French pastor, "New presbyter is but old priest writ large." In every way the parishioners venerated them and attempted to protect them. When an assembly was surprised they tried to enable the pastor to escape. One young clergyman, fleet of foot, rolled up his gown under his arm and outstripped his pursuers, over a hilltop.²⁰ On this occasion, as commonly, outposts were placed, in bee or yellow-jacket fashion, to give the alarm if hostile bodies approached. Not infrequently the Protestants fought for their pastor and for other arrested members. When the pastor Désubas (also written Deshubas) was arrested in his room at Vernoux in 1745, the Protestants of that region made repeated attempts for several days to deliver him from the troops that held him in custody. On the first day of the encounters twenty-eight Protestants were killed and several others wounded; on another day three of the attacking force of sixty were killed and several wounded. For a whole week the excitement continued, and rumors flew that the Protestants planned to attack in sufficiently large numbers to rescue their pastor. Only the arrival of re-inforcements of 100 soldiers early in the week prevented this, and even then

the government found it necessary to transfer the prisoner to Beauregard for safekeeping.²¹ It was always necessary for the government to provide troops at executions, to prevent rescues. Here we see a body of people ready to defy the government if necessary in defence of what they considered their rights, nor was it confined to the Protestants alone as French history of the era affords many instances of citizens attacking the police or the military to rescue prisoners whom they considered unjustly arrested.

The Duc de Mirepoix, commandant of Languedoc, attempted to drive a shrewd bargain with the Protestants in 1756 when he offered to release two merchants arrested at an assembly just outside Nîmes on condition that the pastor, Paul Rabaut, already a leader of the French Protestants, would consent to leave France. Although it was a hard choice Rabaut agreed, but Jean Fabre, volunteering to serve in the galleys for his father, would not accept the proposition and it fell through. Fabre, who gained a European reputation as "L'Honnête Criminel," served six years in the galleys before being released.²²

Another interesting indirect mode of attempting to stifle the Protestant assemblies was made in 1751 by Saint-Priest, intendant of Languedoc. When a pastor and six attendants were captured at an assembly near Caila, he placed fines upon the parishes represented by the Protestants arrested. All the Protestants of those parishes were forced to bear the fine.²³ This action shows a relationship to the suggestion from certain quarters in this country that the federal government impose fines on states in which lynchings occur. The intendant's action had no perceptible effect on the holding of assemblies.

While I have discussed primarily the pastors who were surprised at the assemblies, it should be pointed out that the number of auditors taken into custody was far greater, probably numbering first and last several hundred. They included persons of both sexes and of all ages and conditions of life. Thus, out of nine persons arrested and sent to the galleys for attending a meeting near Mazamet, Languedoc, in 1745, two were nobles who had served in the army and been decorated with the order of Saint Louis, one of the highest distinctions a Frenchman could win.²⁴ One wonders how these two nobles received their decorations, since French Protestants were distinctly excluded from all military decorations, but that is not explained. Of eleven persons taken captive at the meeting at Dions in 1755, when the young pastor outran his pursuers, nearly all were children ten to fifteen or young people aged eighteen to twenty-eight, and all but six obtained freedom by denying that they had come to attend a religious meeting. Four of the convicted were young men, who oddly enough were not sent to the galleys but put into the army

on a six-year sentence. Since it was on the eve of the Seven Years' War, it is possible that the government felt that there was more need of them in the army than in the galleys. Two older men confessed that they attended for religious motives and were sentenced to the galleys, one of them being the father of twelve children. He spent ten years in the galleys before obtaining release.²⁵ In one instance, scourging was inflicted. This was administered by order of Bâville, intendant of Languedoc, to four girls taken at an assembly in 1702. They were whipped in their home town of Beauvoisin. In that assembly fifty persons had been seized, along with the pastor, Petit-Mars, above-mentioned.²⁶ One might relate these cases *ad infinitum*. It appears that mercy was seldom shown, and that nearly all the men convicted were sent to the galleys and the women to convents.

There were a number of other grounds, too, on which Protestants ran afoul of the law. At every turn, it seemed, they ran into difficulty in living as they wished. Marriage, for example, could legally be performed only by a Catholic priest, and the priests were required by their church to demand the promise that the children born of the marriage would be reared as Catholics. Such a promise nearly all of the Protestants refused to make. The confusion that resulted is almost unbelievable. It became the common practice for Protestant couples desiring to marry to draw up their marriage contracts in legal fashion, as was common also among Catholics, and some weeks or months afterwards to be married in the assemblies or in homes by the Protestant pastors. The validity of these marriages was not recognized by the government or by the church, and the children born were regarded as illegitimates. Legally they were not entitled to inherit property, but government officials chose to close their eyes and avoid the weltering confusion that otherwise would have faced them. A few lawsuits appear to have been brought by greedy Catholic next-of-kin, but in general the marriages were recognized not only by the fellow-Protestants but by the Catholics also. Rarely did the government interfere to disrupt one of these illicit marriages.²⁷ The parlement of Grenoble in 1766 did order one Jean Antoine Delègue and "his pretended wife" to cohabit no longer, since their marriage was null and void, and it pronounced any children to be born illegitimate.²⁸ In some cases the government sent the young husbands to the army after giving them the choice between military service and re-marriage by a *curé*.²⁹

Near the French frontiers it was common for couples desiring to marry to slip across the border and be married and then return to France, despite the fact that this procedure was legally forbidden under penalty of confiscation of their property and sentence of the men to the galleys for life.³⁰ Similarly it was forbidden for a French

Protestant to marry a foreigner without royal consent, under like penalty and it was equally forbidden for any tutor or custodian to arrange such a marriage.³¹

Mixed marriages between Catholics and Protestants were not uncommon, although they were discouraged by the clergy of both denominations. It was found, oddly enough, that the Protestants benefitted by such marriages more than did the Catholics, since according to one contemporary report, drawn up on the testimony of three priests, the Catholic wives in all cases adopted the faith of their Protestant husbands, while the Catholic husbands were willing to let their daughters adopt their mothers' faith and the sons to follow theirs.³² Of course the law required that all children be reared in the Catholic faith. An edict of November 1680 forbade marriages in France between Protestants and Catholics,³³ nevertheless in the 1700's they seem to have been commonly permitted if not performed by the curés. I have come across one incident in which a Catholic mother willingly granted permission for her son to marry a Protestant girl (1714), thinking that the girl would adopt her son's religion, but when she learned that her son planned to change his faith she interposed her veto.³⁴ Not until 1774, however, do mixed marriages appear to have been legalized in Alsace.³⁵ The law required that all the children be reared as Catholics.

As already indicated, one of the chief points of conflict was the matter of uprearing the Protestant children. A royal declaration of May 14, 1724 (by the Duc de Bourbon as regent) gave new vigor to the conflict by re-asserting that all children of Protestant parents must be sent to schools and taught the Catholic catechism until they were twelve years of age, and must attend Catholic services regularly until they were twenty. The Catholic clergy were directed to give particular pains to see that such children and youths were well instructed in the principles of Catholicism. Every month local officials were to require of curés, schoolmasters and schoolmistresses a list of all children not attending school and the names of their parents; and every six months these local officials in turn were to submit a report on the matter to their national superiors. Parents failing to send their children to school were to be fined, while those that sent them outside France for their education were to be liable to the heavy fine of 6000 livres for every year the children were abroad.³⁶ This act required the baptism of all children born in France, within twenty-four hours after birth, and it might be deferred beyond the twenty-four period only on the permission of the bishop or archbishop.

Only in rare instances did the Protestants proceed, without further constraint, to send their children to the Catholic schools. Some, however, sent their children to the schools and then set about in their homes to counteract the Catholic instruction. Finding that this

demand was not enough, curés and zealous neighbors reported many cases of negligence to the officials and obtained *lettres de cachet* for the Protestant children and youth to be removed from their homes to monasteries, convents, or Catholic homes, away from parental influence and subjected to careful Catholic indoctrination.³⁸ Literally hundreds of French Protestant youths were uprooted from their families in this fashion during the 1700's.³⁹ It is my impression that most of the youths so confined and indoctrinated were successfully converted to Catholicism. The convents where they were kept were called Maisons des Nouvelles Catholiques. The expenses of those incarcerated were defrayed from the funds arising from fines imposed on Protestants in the kingdom and from the sales or revenues arising from confiscated Protestant property. Thus the émigrés supported financially most of the Catholic missionary effort with Protestant youth in France.

Paradoxical as it may seem, not a few Protestant parents asked to have their children confined in these homes, seemingly to avoid the financial burden of their upkeep; and a number of Protestant youths seized this opportunity to obtain an education at state expense. Many girls remained in these Maisons des Nouvelles Catholiques throughout their lives, even to the age of eighty or ninety.⁴⁰ The hospitals (asylums) and convents of the eighteenth century appear to have made such a miserable job of educating and training for life the boys and girls confined in them that these emerged—if they did emerge—helpless and unequipped to make a living.

In some cases parents petitioned the government for the return of their children, and their requests were granted on the solemn promise that they would in no way interfere with the Catholic indoctrination of their children by the local ecclesiastical authorities.⁴¹

One Protestant youth removed from his home for this indoctrination was placed with the Catholic family of the Héberts at Alençon. From a writer who has examined the matter it has provoked the question as to whether the celebrated Revolutionist, Jacques René Hébert, a son in the home, did not thereby acquire his hatred of king and priest.⁴² For not only did this state of things antagonize the Protestant subjects of the Bourbons but also great numbers of the Catholics.

Not even the Protestants dead and dying were left unmolested. An edict of 1680 enjoined city officials to call on those of the Protestant faith on their deathbed and insist on their conversion, and if they agreed to call in a priest. It was in fact common for priests to visit Protestants seriously ill and demand conversion. Those declining were subject to heavy penalty if they recovered, and if they died their bodies were to be dragged through the streets on a hurdle. Moreover they could not be buried in Catholic cemeteries, else these ceme-

teries would be regarded as "polluted" until the bodies were removed and the ground reconsecrated. In consequence of these regulations, it became common practice for the Protestants to bury their dead in fields, at night, and seldom with the attendance of a pastor, as such occasions furnished traps for his capture. It is said that even today throughout those regions of southern France inhabited by Protestants, from Auvergne to Poitou, the traveler may see hundreds or thousands of small burial plots surrounded by hedges in the fields, often with no more than one or two or three graves.⁴³

Apparently there were not many instances in which bodies were dragged through the street. I have read of several demands for such by fanatics, but they did not always have their way. The little town of Lavaur was the scene of a disgraceful riot that erupted at intervals over several days in July 1749, when a Protestant manufacturer died and his cousin, likewise a Protestant, experienced great difficulty in finding a place for the burial and in getting the grave dug. The *maréchaussée*, or mounted police, had to be called in on two different nights while two successive graves were being dug. On both occasions, the body was dug up by the rioters, despite precautions to prevent such, and, according to the reports that reached the cousin afterwards, the head of the corpse was severed from the body. The cousin, however, had left in haste following the second burial, fearing for his safety, and did not venture back. For the second burial he had filled the coffin with quicklime, but even this deterrent was not sufficient protection.⁴⁴ It is surprising that on this occasion, as on others, relatives or friends of the dead approached Catholic authorities asking for permission to bury them on consecrated ground. They had every reason to know in advance that they could only expect refusal. And yet the number of these recorded requests leads one to wonder if in some instances they had not, been granted by *lax curés*.

Not always were the Catholics at fault; the Protestants themselves could be provoking. The story is recorded of Cavalier, leader of the Protestants in the Camisard uprising early in the century, that in 1704 he and a group of his subordinates were en route to Paris to confer with Louis XIV about settling their differences in the Cevennes. They were traveling under safe-conduct. At Maçon a soldier in the group died and Cavalier asked the mayor of Maçon, Desvignes, for a place where the soldier might be interred. Desvignes showed him the Protestant burial ground but informed him that interment must be made at night and without noise. Cavalier, with impertinence, proceeded to bury the man at eight o'clock in the morning, in broad daylight, and with several discharges of musketry.⁴⁵ The authorities were indignant but nothing could be done.

In view of the nettling disabilities that faced them at every turn,

it is not surprising that the Protestants of the mountain region in southeast France, known as the Cevennes, rose in insurrection during the years 1702-04, when France with Spain as her ally was fighting most of the nations of Europe, in the War of the Spanish Succession. It is only surprising that she did not have a similar uprising in every great war that she experienced from 1685 to the outbreak of her Revolution. The insurrection of 1702-04, known as the War of the Camisards from the fact that Protestant fighters wore *camisas* (peasants' shirts) as a means of mutual recognition, particularly in their night attacks, was a brutal civil war of guerrilla type, in which little if any quarter was shown by either side and burnings of churches and the homes of priests offset the burnings of Protestant villages. In short, the region of the Cevennes, in Auvergne and Languedoc, was in no small part laid waste by fire and the sword, with perhaps more reprisals being made at night than by day. To such a degree was this true that the very word *camisarde* has passed into history as the synonym of a military night attack.

The insurrection was provoked by the zealous anti-Protestant crusade in southeast France that was being intensified at the time of the outbreak, by officials on the one hand and certain priests on the other, the most active of whom was the Abbé Chayla (name also spelled Cheyla and Cayla). For some time this abbé had been very zealous in his conversion of Protestants, and had won Protestant hatred. One night in July, 1702, he was attacked and killed in a house at Pont de Montvert, in Languedoc, by a Protestant mob which had quickly gathered on the news being spread that a number of Protestants attempting to flee into Switzerland had been arrested with their guide and were confined in the same house with the abbé. The object of the mob was to release the prisoners and prevent their being sent to the galleys and the convents, and in this they succeeded. They then set fire to a chapel in the house. Chayla leaped from a window, hoping to escape, but was captured and offered the sarcastic alternative of abjuring Catholicism or being killed. Refusing to abjure, he was dispatched with several bayonet thrusts. His valet was wounded and so, too, was the schoolmaster. Then, according to report that reached the government, the Protestants held an assembly on the bridge in the town and sang Psalms.⁴⁶

The incident aroused great indignation in the officials and among the Catholics in general, and the government determined that it must be severely punished. Troops (already in Languedoc) were massed for the purpose and the fight was on.

The chief Protestant leader was Cavalier, a young man in his twenties and of small stature. He had been a baker. He possessed such qualities of leadership as were needed for the guerrilla fighting of the next two years, and his name became venerated among the

Protestants and feared among the Catholics. A second leader, of lesser ability perhaps but of more determined zeal, was a romantic young man called Rolland (his real name being Pierre Laporte). The king's forces against them were led at first by Montrevel, and later by the Protestant apostate Julien, who had a burning hatred for his former co-religionists. Both used brutal methods, even as did the Camisards.

For two years terrorism was the order of the day, as members of the clergy on each side were captured and executed, Camisards broken at the wheel and revenge taken on Protestant pastors turning Catholic (as some did), innocent members of both sides murdered, and churches and villages burned.⁴⁷ On several occasions the Camisards put on the uniform of the government troops for deceptive purposes, and made attacks in them.⁴⁸ They captured the Comte De Broglie, one of the leaders of the government troops, and cut off his head and nailed it to the bridge of Anduze.⁴⁹ Louis XIV at the first was reluctant to give orders for the burning of Protestant homes, hoping to make further use of them, and ordered instead that the roofs be removed. This, however, proved impractical as it took too long, and the orders for burning ensued.⁵⁰ Bâville, the intendant of Languedoc, and the Maréchal Montrevel thought to win the war by devastating the country and incarcerating women, children, and old men. At Nîmes the troops of Montrevel set fire to a mill where were gathered some Protestant women and children;⁵¹ and when the inhabitants of Mialet sheltered some Camisards after defeat in a certain battle, Julien ordered the entire population of the town deported.⁵²

After two years of this savage contest in which perhaps an equal degree of brutality had been shown by each side, the government had gained little headway and fortunately changed commanders, displacing Menevel by Marshal Villars, fresh from his recent victories at Friedlingen and Keyl, a man of first-rate ability. He at once saw the futility of pursuing the methods of Menevel and Julien and insisted on a policy of moderation. He set out to pacify the Camisards by offering pardon to those who would lay down their arms and fight for the king on a battlefield elsewhere than in southeastern France, although he did not offer in any way to modify the terms under which the Protestants in France lived. He proceeded to surround the Camisard forces with a cordon of his own, to forestall them getting reinforcements or supplies, yet refrained from attacking them. All executions, burnings, and other reprisals he ordered stopped. This policy led him into conflict with the Marquis De la Vrillière, recent ambassador to Savoy and royal councillor, and he was obliged to write defending his policy both to the Marquis and to the king. But he was able to meet success through this method. Within two months Cavalier and about 150 of his followers laid down their arms, on the

understanding that they might go into exile in Switzerland (the king's government being reluctant to permit them to fight for him on the Spanish front because of Spanish opposition), and negotiations were opened with Rolland. Some of Rolland's leading subordinates surrendered, and he himself appeared to waver. According to rumor that reached the government, his mother and a fifteen-year-old brother reproached him for his weakness and swore to continue the opposition themselves even if he surrendered. The story may have no foundation, but it vividly illustrates the fanaticism that animated the Camisards.⁵³ For several months Rolland and a group of his followers continued the fight, until he was betrayed by a member of his sect (for 100 louis d'or) while visiting his sweetheart, a girl named Cornelly, at or near the Château de Castlneau (near D'Usés), August 15, 1704. The government had a trap. Rolland was shot trying to escape from the Château, and five of the eight men with him were taken prisoners and broken at the wheel. Rolland's body was dragged through the streets of Nîmes and afterwards burned. The execution of the five, though carried out with great *éclat* (five bishops being present for the ceremony), had a revolting effect upon many of those present. The constancy of the five men, and especially that of Maillé, who though struck sixty times (instead of the customary eleven) took it with stoical silence, won them much sympathy from the crowd, and Villars wrote to the government that this sort of execution did more harm than good.⁵⁴ He advised that a quicker mode of execution be found, as he thought those executed on this occasion became heroes to the crowd of three thousand present.

This incident was followed by some savage reprisals from each side, but Rolland's death and the subsequent surrender of a small detachment under Salles in early January 1705 enabled Villars to write to the minister of war that the Camisard insurrection could be regarded as ended. His epigrammatical sentence ran: "I shall no longer have the honor to write you on this matter."⁵⁵

It was the common charge of government authorities of the time—Baville, Broglie, Villars, and others—that the Camisards were aided, encouraged, and even instigated by parties or governments outside France.⁵⁶

Protestant leaders at the time denied it⁵⁷ and it has been denied even in our own times by Protestant leaders,⁵⁸ nevertheless the government did find proof at the time of such aid, through some letters found on the body of a dead soldier and through the capture of two officers in foreign service with the Camisards.⁵⁹ This proof of foreign aid has been substantiated by a Catholic scholar, the Abbé Joseph Dedieu, who after delving deeply into the government correspondence of the period both in the French Archives Nationales and in the British Public Record Office published in 1920 his findings in an able

book entitled *Le rôle politique des Protestants français* (1685-1715).

The Abbé Dedieu declares that the Protestant ferment in the Cevennes in the early 1700's did have outside stirring. He charges a number of Huguenot clergymen resident in Holland, England, and Switzerland, Jurieu above all, as being chiefly to blame for instigating and fanning the movement.⁶⁰ They had political agents and others to approach the allied governments pitted against France, especially Britain and the Low Countries, with the idea of sending a fleet and military force into the Mediterranean to succor the Camisards, who on their part would cooperate. Britain and the United Provinces were prevailed on to plan a diversion of this sort, but they never gave it much support. The Abbé Guiscard, a disgruntled Frenchman, suggested that Protestant and Catholic subjects of Louis XIV alike arise against his despotism and set up civil and religious liberty and restore provincial liberties.⁶¹ The British sent two vessels with men and arms, but they were captured before landing. The Huguenot leaders, on their part, evinced no interest in the scheme of Guiscard, declaring that they were loyal subjects of the king.⁶² The British and Dutch governments continued plans for an expedition to relieve the Camisards (being urged on by the Duc de Miremont, a Huguenot leader), but nothing came of them.⁶³ It would have been strangely illogical for the French Protestants not to enter into negotiations with foreign powers, when there was such a community of interests between them. That was no less than the Irish did in the great wars of the same century wherein Britain was involved. It is ironical that the Protestants insisted throughout the century, as they did, that they were loyal subjects of the king. Dedieu has published a subsequent book, *Histoire politique des Protestants français* (1715-1794) (Paris, 1925), based on the study of manuscripts in the Archives Nationales, in which he insists that in all the eighteenth-century wars the French Protestants were regarded as disloyal by the intendants and their subdelegates, conniving for enemy (especially British) success. Much of the subsequent persecution, according to Dedieu, arose from this fact.⁶⁴

While the Protestants might have gotten some aid from foreign sources, it is clear from the contemporary evidence that they got much more aid from their fellow Catholics. Nor does it appear that this aid was constrained, but rather that it was rendered freely by neighbors that sympathized with them. Bâville executed six persons at Nîmes in July 1703, two by breaking at the wheel and four by hanging, for aiding the Camisards.⁶⁵ Mialet, as already mentioned, was depopulated for sheltering Camisard fugitives in 1704.⁶⁶ Food, wine, and other assistance likewise was rendered.⁶⁷ In fact, if aid had not been rendered them and sympathy for them did not exist on the part of their Catholic neighbors, the Protestants could not long have re-

sisted the government. Not only the Camisard insurrection would have been brief, Protestantism itself would probably have been rapidly exterminated. That Protestantism survived at all in France in the eighteenth century appears to me to have been contingent upon the fact that a large body of the French people, more particularly the friends and neighbors of the Protestants, shrugged their shoulders at the barbarous edicts and ignored them. Friendship was stronger than fanatical zeal. After all, the Protestants followed rigorously the same code of morality as did they, and there was no reason save religious fanaticism for the persecution. It should not be forgotten that in the Wars of Religion of the sixteenth century one of the three great parties had been the Politiques, tolerant Catholics who opposed persecution and desired peace and tolerance. It was the spiritual descendants of these people who made possible the survival of Protestantism. No less a person than Lebret *père*, celebrated intendant of Provence in the early 1700's, shared these views. He advocated mildness in dealing with the Protestant Question, and in permitting all to emigrate who so desired.⁶⁸ Protestants and their neighbor Catholics usually got along on very friendly terms, one often being guest of the other at meals. It was not uncommon, in fact, for Protestants to have priests to meals, and vice versa.⁶⁹ It has been said that Protestants not infrequently gave fees to the curés of their community for weddings and baptisms as though they had been performed by them, and that the curés observed silence.⁷⁰ In general, however, the curés were more zealous than their parishioners, and the Protestants laid most of their troubles at the door of priestly zeal. The Jesuits were particularly active in this respect, being regarded as more zealous than the others, and it is worthy of attention that after their trouble with the government began in 1762, persecution of the Protestants was never again severe.

Following the War of the Camisards, in fact, persecution of the Protestants was not actively pursued except at intervals. To be sure, the laws against expression of their religion in any form remained against them, and the professional disabilities continued in effect, but there was a tendency to wink at their enforcement, except in those periods of intensification, that lasted two or three years in succession every decade. The periods of intensification remind us greatly of the persecution of the early Christians in the days of the Roman empire, which was very intermittent and on the whole much less drastic than that of eighteenth-century France. On several occasions these periods of intensification in Protestant persecution coincided with the eighteenth-century wars in which France was engaged. Among the periods of oppression (though not an exclusive list) were the years 1714-15, 1724, 1745-46, 1748, 1752-54 and 1762. By 1757, however, conditions had become lax enough in some regions for the Protestants to rebuild

their temples, although these were subsequently demolished by the soldiers (*dragons*), and assemblies were held openly and unmolested in some villages.⁷¹ Although assemblies were dispersed by troops and those who attended them were arrested as late as the 1750's, and Protestants retaliated by killing priests (in 1752), these incidents became progressively rarer after the first decade of the century. In fact, it appears that Huguenot pastors, after the half-century mark, were seldom molested and often were allowed to move about openly. Certainly in the 1780's Paul Rabaut and his two sons worked undisturbed as pastors in various cities of southeast France, highly regarded by their Catholic neighbors as well as their own flocks. One of the sons, Rabaut Saint-Etienne, was elected by the Third Estate of Nîmes as its deputy to the Estates General of 1789, where he played the leading rôle in obtaining civil rights for the Protestants.

This relaxation of the penal laws, however, came slowly, as indeed do all social changes. It was necessary for men's minds to change. The ferment was at work throughout the century, and more especially after 1750. It was due to several factors, which need description at some length. One of them, without question, was the revolt in men's minds resulting from witnessing and hearing of the persecutions. The calmness with which most of the executed went to their death aided in this respect, as Villars pointed out in his letter to Chamillart. There was one trial and execution in particular that had such a great retroactive effect that it deserves some discussion. This was the trial and death of Jean Calas, the wholesale importer of Toulouse, who was arrested and brought to trial before the parlement of that city on the charge of murdering his eldest son, Marc Antoine, October, 1761, and at length was declared guilty by the court and executed by breaking at the wheel, March 10, 1762. The case has become one of the most noted *causes célèbres* of history, and even today there is divergence of opinion on the question of Calas's guilt. The Protestant scholar R. R. Palmer of Princeton University is inclined toward the view that Calas was guilty,⁷² while the French Catholic scholar, Alex Coutet, after examining the case from original sources, published a book in 1933 in which he insists, like Voltaire, that Calas was innocent.⁷⁴ Calas was convicted on circumstantial evidence. He was a stern Calvinist and had already revealed his dislike of the conversion to Catholicism of his second son, Louis, who desired to become a physician and found the way barred as long as he remained a Protestant. Let it be said that before anyone could be licensed in France as a physician, surgeon, lawyer, apothecary, book-dealer, or printer, it was necessary that he be a Roman Catholic in good standing and produce a statement from his curé or vicar to this effect. In fact, he could not study medicine in one of the French universities, nor could such a person serve in any capacity in a law court

or in the administration of law in France, nor hold any political office, even to being mayor or alderman (*échevin*). This was clearly stated in a royal declaration of May 14, 1724, and it was not revoked or modified until 1790, when the National Assembly accorded full civil rights to Protestants.⁷⁵

Louis in 1760 appealed to the intendant Saint-Priest to compel his father to grant him financial aid, which he said had been withheld from him for five years because of his conversion to Catholicism. Saint-Priest ordered his subdelegate to investigate the case, and on learning that Calas was a well-to-do but very stubborn Huguenot, prescribed that he should be required to pay the son 600 livres, 503 of it to be used to pay the son's indebtedness for apprenticeship and the remainder to be used for the son's upkeep until he could earn his own way.⁷⁶ Even then there was opposition and haggling on the part of Calas, and he had to be ordered again to make the payment. At length in September 1761, he made settlement to the intendant's satisfaction.⁷⁷

Hardly was this matter ended before the mysterious death of Marc Antoine, the eldest son, occurred on the night of October 13, 1761, in a shop on the ground floor of the Calas home. The family had at supper that evening a young man named Gobert Lavoisse, son of a celebrated lawyer, and a Protestant. As supper was ended Marc Antoine arose and left, as was his custom, departing through the kitchen. The rest of the family and their guest retired to the living room and chatted until 9:45 or 10:00 p. m., when Lavoisse arose to go. Awakening their son Pierre who had fallen asleep in an armchair, the parents bade him take a torch and accompany Lavoisse to the street. The two youths descended the steps and emitted a cry, "Ah, mon Dieu!" as they beheld the body of Marc Antoine suspended by a cord in the shop. The parents rushed down, the father preceding the mother, both of them having difficulty in realizing that the son was dead and trying to revive him with brandy.⁷⁸ Both were in despair on learning the true situation.⁷⁹ The body was hanging from a cord, and Marc Antoine's coat was lying folded on a counter. Was it a case of murder or of suicide? According to the Widow Calas and her sons and the servant, the husband and all who had been at supper had been upstairs throughout the evening.⁸⁰ And so far as known, no one else had entered the home. The *capitouls* (aldermen) of the city and a surgeon were at once summoned by the family. The body was removed to the hôtel de ville and examined by a surgeon who gave sworn testimony, and the *capitouls* concluded that the father, possibly assisted by his wife, son, Lavoisse, or Jeannette, the family servant (a Catholic), had strangled Marc Antoine, and ordered all to jail, where they spent the next five months.⁸¹

The *capitouls* asked for all who could render light on the matter

to come forward, and a crowd (*foule*) did so, with the result that the slain youth was made to appear a Catholic martyr. It was reported that he was to have made abjuration of Protestantism the next day and to have received his first communion as a Catholic. He thus became instantly an object of Catholic veneration. The rumor was even started that he was to have entered the order of the White Penitents the next day. Thereupon the *capitouls* ordered Marc Antoine buried in the church of Saint-Etienne. There was a pompous ceremony, in which forty priests and all the White Penitents of the city took part. This was followed by subsequent requiem services in his honor. Marc Antoine, the dead Protestant, had suddenly become a Catholic martyr.⁸² On the other hand, Huguenots having confidence in Jean Calas began trooping into the city, and the authorities feared that they designed to release him by force. Guards about the prison were doubled and no one was permitted to see the prisoners.⁸³ Thus the case came to be a tug of war between the two opposing religious groups.

A preliminary trial by the parlement of Toulouse was held December 5 and a tentative decision was reached that Calas was guilty of murder, but a verdict was not passed. Thenceforth, however, the outcome was virtually assured. The definitive trial came March 9, 1762, when Calas was pronounced guilty of murder and was condemned to be broken at the wheel (alive), and his body to hang two hours and later to be burned and the ashes scattered to the winds.⁸⁴ In accordance with sentences of this type, the condemned man's property was ordered confiscated.

Execution took place the following day, March 10. Calas went to his death with remarkable fortitude, bearing the pain silently and spurning all efforts to make him abjure Protestantism. So reported both the subdelegate Amblard and the diarist Pierre Barthès, the latter recording that Calas "suffered the execution with a prodigious constancy and never wished to yield to the holy remonstrances of two Dominicans, the Reverend Pères Bourges and Cadaguès, who from four o'clock in the morning until six in the evening did not cease to persuade him to save his soul."⁸⁵ Barthès describes Calas as sixty-seven years of age, tall and well proportioned, a native of Cabarède. He was a man little given to sentiment, but self-reliant and determined.

Few executions have had greater significance. To begin with, the question of his guilt was far from certain. The decision was reached on circumstantial evidence, and it was not convincing. If the words of his wife and his sons Donat and Pierre be accepted as valid testimony, he had been upstairs throughout the evening and could not have participated in the crime. Certainly the wife, Pierre, Lavaisse, and the servant testified alike in his behalf. His wife had faith in him and continued to fight to rehabilitate his name, going to

Paris and seeking to obtain a retrial. His fellow Huguenots had faith in him and raised a fund to aid Madame Calas in this fight. So too, later, did the Protestants of Great Britain.⁸⁶ Voltaire in 1762 became interested in the case and invited to Ferney two of the Calas sons, who had fled to Geneva, to inform him on the details of the case. Convinced of the innocence of Calas, he threw his full efforts into the fight to get a retrial, and during the next three years wrote or edited many brochures to this end, the most famous being his *Traité sur la tolérance*.⁸⁷ His propaganda brought the matter anew before the French public. The royal council on March 7, 1764 ordered a retrial, and on June 4 set aside the verdict of the parlement of Toulouse. In March 1765 the case was at length tried anew before forty judges, masters of requests, in Paris, one of the number being Turgot. Unanimously these judges declared Calas an innocent man.⁸⁸ At last his name was restored. The government proceeded to indemnify the Calas family by a gift of 36,000 livres, half of it to the widow for gratification and for reimbursement of expenditures in connection with the trial, the remainder to be divided between the two daughters, the three sons, and the servant.⁸⁹ This sum, however, was not as ample as it might appear to have been, since the costs to Madame Calas in her efforts to obtain a new trial had been very great.

Nor did the case rest closed. With the outbreak of the Revolution, it was reopened. Calas became a hero—a representative of oppressed France. Three separate dramas based on the Calas episode were presented in Parisian theatres in December 1790 and January 1791, following the extension of full civil rights to the Protestants by the National Assembly.⁹⁰

The condemnation and execution of Calas had acted as a boomerang. This has been the case with other familiar examples in history. Persecution is a dangerous device. An old professor of mine once told his class that persecution may prove a successful weapon if rigorously applied, as in the Spanish Reformation, but not if it is applied half-heartedly. The Protestant persecution of the eighteenth century was, all in all, of this latter type, with only officials and priests and a segment of the population enthusiastically for it. A large portion of the French people little desired it from the outset, and this body grew in numbers steadily as the century advanced. Their humanity cried out against ecclesiastical zeal.

(To be concluded)

- 1 The author acknowledges his indebtedness to the Social Science Research Council for a grant-in-aid which made possible the gathering of most of the material in this article.
- 2 Henri Lehr, *Les Protestants d'autrefois: sur mer et outre mer* (Paris, 1907), pp. 219-20.
- 3 P. Forbrune-Berbinau, "Fugatifs du Périgord arrêtés en Belgique en 1701," *Bulletin of the Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français*, L I (1902), 546-47. This journal is hereinafter referred to as *Bulletin SHPF*.
- 4 *Ibid.* See also P. Mazaurie, "Le parlement de Metz et les Protestants après la Révocation," *Bulletin SHPF*, LXXXIV (1935), 386-87.
- 5 P. Beuzart, "Les fugatifs Protestant devant le parlement de Flandre depuis la Révocation jusqu'à la mort de Louis XIV," *Bulletin SHPF*, LXXIII (1924), 179. On p. 180 is a chart of Protestant convictions on various grounds by the court year by year for the period 1686-1704.
- 6 *Ibid.*, p. 177.
- 7 Lehr, *op. cit.*, pp. 227-28.
- 8 François Reverdin, "Prosélytes et réfugiés," *Bulletin SHPF*, LXXVI (1927), 51-9, 236-54.
- 9 F. Reverdin, "Prosélytes et réfugiés à Genève de 1714 à 1717," *Bulletin SHPF*, LXXIX (1930), 482.
- 10 Baronne de Charnisay, "Les chiffres de M. l'Abbé Rouquette; étude sur les fugatifs du Languedoc (Uzès)," *Bulletin SHPF*, LXXI (1922), 103-12.
- 11 V. L. Bourilly, "Les Protestants de Provence et d'Orange sous Louis XIV," *Bulletin SHPF*, LXXVI (1927), 196-97.
- 12 Fremenville, *Dictionnaire ou traité de la police* (Paris, 1771), pp. 107-09.
- 13 Albert Atger, "Gaspard de Calvière. Sa famille. Sa mort (1702)," *Bulletin SHPF*, LXXXVI (1937), 330.
- 14 "Arrest de la Cour de Parlement, etc.," *Bulletin SHPF*, LI (1902), 422-23. Among others hung and strangled were Pierre Durand (1732) and François Rochette (1762). See *Bulletin SHPF*, LXXI (1932), 6, and the *Histoire générale de Languedoc*, edited by Devie and Vaissette, XIV, 2250-51.
- 15 Emile G. Léonard, "La vie des Protestants au XVIII^e siècle dans le marquisat d'Anbais (Sénéchaussée de Nîmes)," *Bulletin SHPF*, LXXI (1922), 213.
- 16 *Ibid.*, LXXII, 14.
- 17 Emile G. Léonard, "Les Assemblées de Désert: caractères, adversaires et conséquences," *Bulletin SHPF*, LXXXVII (1938), 482.
- 18 *Ibid.*, pp. 482-83.
- 19 "Paris en 1773 d'après une descendant de hugenots réfugiés à Cassel," *Bulletin SHPF*, LI (1902), 555. Cf. "Une dénonciation contre Mare Guitton, chapelain de l'ambassade de Hollande (1725)," *Bulletin SHPF*, LXV (1916), 305-12.
- 20 André Fabre, "Une Assemblée du Désert surprise en 1755 à Dions," *Bulletin SHPF*, LXXXVII (1938), 136-38.
- 21 "Relation sur la prise du ministre Desubas (11-12 décembre 1745)," *Bulletin SHPF*, LXXI (1922), 244-46.
- 22 Armand Lods, "Paul Rabaut et le Due de Mirepoix: à propos de la condamnation aux galères de Jean Fabre et d'Honoré Turge, d'après un document inédit," *Bulletin SHPF*, LXXIII (1924), 210-14. According to the manuscript cited by Lods, Rabaut left France and the two convicted men were released, but Rabaut's continued presence in France renders this incredible. See the account by H. M. Baird, *The Revocation of the Edict of Nantes* (New York, 1895, 2v.), II, 494-95.
- 23 Léonard, "La vie des Protestants," etc. *Bulletin SHPF*, LXXI, 216-17.
- 24 *Histoire générale de Languedoc, avec des notes et pièces justificatives* par Dom Cl. Devie & Dom J. Vaissette [. . . continuée jusques en 1790 par Ernest Roschach], Toulouse, 1872-92 [93], XIII, 1073.
- 25 Fabre, *op. cit.*, LXXXVII, 140-42.
- 26 Atger, *op. cit.*, LXXXVI, 330.
- 27 Léonard, "La vie des Protestants," etc., *Bulletin SHPF*, LXXII, 15-8, 116 n. 2; L. Greib, "Etat civil protestant: Rapports des Réformés du Pays Messin et de la Champagne, avec paroisses de Diedendorf et de Rauweiler (1698-1776)," *Bulletin SHPF*, LXXXI (1932), 170-74.
- 28 *Bulletin SHPF*, LI, 423.
- 29 "Le service militaire imposé aux Huguenots comme un châtiment (1767-1768)," *Bulletin SHPF*, L (1901), 251-56.
- 30 Grieg, *op. cit.*.
- 31 By the royal declaration of May 14, 1724. Fremenville, *op. cit.*, p. 312.
- 32 Léonard, "La vie des Protestants," etc., *Bulletin SHPF*, LXXII, 86.
- 33 Jean Albert, "Un projet d'Edit de Tolérance (1776)," *Bulletin SHPF*, LXXXVI (1937), 630.
- 34 "Révocation de consentement donné au mariage d'Alexandre Maze avec Susanne Pusaux, 1714," *Bulletin SHPF*, LXIX (Paris, 1920), 25-7.
- 35 Rod. Reuss, "Un chapitre de l'histoire des persécutions religieuses: le clergé catholique et les enfants illégitimes protestants et israélites en Alsace, au XVIII^e siècle et au début de la Révolution," *Bulletin SHPF*, LII (1903), 26 n. 1; *Archives parlementaires*, sér. 1, XXI, 461.
- 36 Fremenville, *op. cit.*, pp. 305-07.
- 37 *Ibid.*, p. 305.
- 38 On this point let it be said that many Scotch Catholic youth were treated in the same fashion in the seventeenth century. See Alphons Bellesheim, *History of the Catholic Church of Scotland* (Edinburgh and London, 1890) IV, 16-7, 34-5, 144-45.
- 39 See my *Government Assistance in Eighteenth-Century France* (Durham, 1946), pp. 325-28. The *Inventaire-sommaire des*

- archives départementales antérieures à 1790, Calvados, série C, contains under "lettres de cachet" descriptions of scores of such cases in the vicinity of Caen alone. The departmental archives at Bordeaux contain a similar amount of material on the matter.
- 40 See again my *Government Assistance*, pp. 325-28. Cf. G. Dubois, "Les enlèvements d'enfants protestants et la communauté des Nouvelles Catholiques de Rouen au XVIII^e siècle," *Bulletin SHPF*, LXXXV (1936), 280-327.
 - 41 As an illustration, see L. Duval, "Hébert chez lui," *La Révolution française*, XII (1887), 976-77.
 - 42 *Ibid.*, 977, 979-80.
 - 43 Th. Maillard, "Les sépultures huguenotes en plain champ," *Bulletin SHPF*, LXXI (1922), 59; Léonard, "La vie des Protestants," etc., *Bulletin SHPF*, LXXII, 22-4; Freminville, *op. cit.*, pp. 116-17.
 - 44 Gaston Tourneur, "Une grave émeute à Lavaur (à l'occasion de l'inhumation d'un Protestant, 1749)," *Bulletin SHPF*, LXXV (1926), 48-59.
 - 45 Frank Puaux, "Les Camisards à Macon," *Bulletin SHPF*, LX (1911), 438-39.
 - 46 *Histoire générale de Languedoc*, XIV, 1567-74.
 - 47 *Ibid.*, XIV, 1581, 1583; Frank Puaux, "Le dépeuplement et incendie des Hautes-Cevennes (octobre-décembre 1703)," *Bulletin SHPF*, LXIV (1915), 64-7, 60-65. Charles Bost, "Les pasteurs Astruc. Le père de Jean Astruc," *Bulletin SHPF*, LXVI (1917), 64-7.
 - 48 Frank Puaux, "Les mémoires de Cavalier sur la guerre des Cevennes," *Bulletin SHPF*, LXVII (1918), 11.
 - 49 *Ibid.*, p. 13.
 - 50 Puaux, "Le dépeuplement," etc., *Bulletin*, LXIV, 596-97, 601-05.
 - 51 *Ibid.*, LXIV, 594.
 - 52 *Ibid.*, pp. 594-95.
 - 53 *Hist. gén. de Languedoc*, XIV, 1984-85, 1989, 1990-97. Cavalier received a pension of 2000 livres and agreed to "advise" the French government on the Protestant Question from Geneva. He was regarded as bribed, both by Villars (*Ibid.*, 1999) and by many of the Protestants. Afterwards he wrote his *Mémoires*, relating details of the Camisard War. He lived to a considerable age, and in general was highly respected by the Protestants.
 - 54 Baronne de Charnisay, "Un héros de vingt-quatre ans: les dernières semaines et la mort de Rolland (juin-août 1704)," *Bulletin SHPF*, LXXVII (1927), 226-31.
 - 55 *Histoire générale de Languedoc*, XIV, 2008. Salles, like Cavalier, was bribed with the small pension of 200 livres a year to use his influence to aid the government in the Protestant Question, from Geneva, where he was permitted to emigrate.
 - 56 The charge is repeatedly made in the correspondence of these men in vol. XIV of the *Histoire générale de Languedoc*.
 - 57 *Ibid.*, XIV, 2008; Frank Puaux, "Au camp des Camisards," *Bulletin SHPF*, LIX (1910), 425-36.
 - 58 See book review by Ch. Bost, *Bulletin SHPF*, LXXIV (1925), 104-05.
 - 59 *Histoire générale de Languedoc*, 2006-07, 2017, 2020.
 - 60 *Ibid.*, pp. 98-9, 103ff.
 - 61 *Ibid.*, p. 113.
 - 62 *Ibid.*, p. 113.
 - 63 *Ibid.*, p. 117.
 - 64 See *Bulletin SHPF*, 104-05.
 - 65 Puaux, "Au camp des Camisards," *Bulletin*, LIX, 427.
 - 66 Puaux, "Le dépeuplement," etc., *Bulletin*, LXIV, 594-95.
 - 67 Puaux, "Au camp des Camisards," *Bulletin*, 425-27, 432.
 - 68 *Bulletin SHPF*, LXXVI (1927), 196.
 - 69 *Bulletin*, LXXII, 29-30.
 - 70 Bost, review of book by Dedieu, *Bulletin SHPF*, LXXIV (1925), 106 n. 1.
 - 71 Léonard, "La vie des Protestants," etc., *Bulletin*, LXII, 13-4. According to Bost (*Bulletin*, LXXIV, 108, n. 1), the Protestants held open assemblies widely in 1744 while the soldiers were at the front. Their audacity led to the persecution of 1746.
 - 72 See his *Catholics and Unbelievers in Eighteenth-Century France* (Princeton, 1939), pp. 15-6. He believes that Calas killed his son accidentally.
 - 73 Jean Calas, *roué vif et innocent*.
 - 74 The book is reviewed in the *Bulletin SHPF*, LXXXIII (1934), 714-18, where it is pronounced the ablest study that has appeared on the subject.
 - 75 Freminville, *op. cit.*, p. 310.
 - 76 *Histoire générale de Languedoc*, XIV, 2234-35.
 - 77 *Ibid.*, XIV, 2236.
 - 78 *L'eau de la reine d'Hongrie*.
 - 79 Details given in a letter by the Widow Calas, June 15, 1762, and in statements by the sons Donat and Pierre Calas, dated July 22-3, 1762, reprinted in *Oeuvres complètes de Voltaire*, nouv. éd. (Paris, 1877-85, 52v), XXII, 365-69, 388-89; also in official documents reprinted in *Histoire générale de Languedoc*, XIV, 2237.
 - 80 *Oeuvres de Voltaire*, XXIV, 368, 372, 389.
 - 81 *Hist. gén. de Languedoc*.
 - 82 *Oeuvres complètes de Voltaire*, XXII, 389.
 - 83 *Histoire générale de Languedoc*, XIV, 2238-39.
 - 84 *Ibid.*, XIV, 2239-41.
 - 85 *Ibid.*, XIV, 2241-47. Pierre Calas in his statement of 1762 refers to these two confessors as Jacobins, and asserts that they were convinced of his father's innocence, *Oeuvres de Voltaire*, xxiv, 396. Donat Calas, however, in his statement calls them Dominicans. *Ibid.*, xxiv, 390.

86 *Ibid.*, XIV, 2249.

87 See *Oeuvres de Voltaire*, XXIV, 365 n. 1, XXV, 13-118.

88 Gustave Schelle, ed., *Oeuvres de Turgot*, II (Paris, 1914), 434-35. According to Du Pont de Nemours, Turgot took an active part in the retrial proceedings.

89 "Le Roi, de son côté, donne 36,000 livres, dont 18,000 à la veuve, savoir, 6000 per forme de gratification, 6000 pour les dépenses du voyage, 6000 pour les frais du procès. De 18,000 restant il y a 6000 pour chacun des 2 filles, 3000 pour le fils

[les fils?], & 3000 pour le servante." *Mercur historique et politique* for May 1765, CLVIII, 550-51.

90 By the authors Marie Joseph Chénier, Lemière d'Argy, and J. L. Laya respectively. All three plays were published as well as presented on the stage. In 1791 a fourth play, by Pujoux, entitled *La veuve Calas à Paris*, was also performed in Paris and published. *Oeuvres complètes de Voltaire*, nouv. ed., XXII, 367 n.; Armand Lods, "Les dernières victims d'intolérance," *Bulletin SHPF*, LI (1902), 514.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL,
APRIL 20, 1951

The Council of the Society met in the president's office at Gettysburg Seminary from 1:00 to 2:30 P. M. and from 4:45 to 5:30 P. M. Members in attendance were President Ray C. Petry, Guy S. Klett, Sidney E. Mead, Ernest G. Schwiebert, L. J. Trinterud, and Raymond W. Albright.

The minutes of the Council session held at Oberlin, Ohio, on April 21, 1950, were approved as printed in *Church History*, June 1950. The following persons, properly nominated, were elected as members of the society subject to constitutional provision:

J. Everett Arden	James D. Mosteller
Robert S. Cope	Walter C. Schnackenberg, Jr.
George H. Fadenrecht	Cyril C. Simkins
Jack Wesley Fall	William G. Ward
Howard B. Ford, Jr.	Leo F. Solt
Robert D. Fuller	

The council voted to request the treasurer to arrange to be bonded in the amount of \$10,000.

Upon the report of Wilhelm Pauck, for the editors, the council voted that Ira V. Brown shall be permitted to have his Brewer Prize essay printed by a commercial publisher under the following arrangements: 1) on publication our treasurer shall pay the publisher \$500.00 and, 2) the designation "Frank S. and Elizabeth D. Brewer Prize Essay of the American Society of Church History" shall appear on the title page.

The report of the committee for the revision of the Constitution and the By-Laws was presented by Raymond W. Albright.

The Council voted to accept the report with thanks and instructed the secretary to circulate copies to all members of the Council and former members of the Council still active with the request that it be examined between now and the annual meeting and that if in the judgment of any it be not an adequate statement of the present Constitution and By-Laws of the Society they shall be prepared to challenge it at the annual meeting, and that in the absence of such challenge it shall be accepted by the Council.

The following revisions were voted by the Council for consideration at the next annual meeting,

1) that Article IV of the Constitution be revised by substituting for "four" the words "as many other members as necessary to complete the roster of the Council,"

2) that Article V of the Constitution be revised by substituting for "a chairman of the Editorial Board" the words "editor or editors."

Attest: Raymond W. Albright,
Secretary

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE SOCIETY
APRIL 20, 1951

President Ray C. Petry called the seventieth meeting of the society into session at 4:45 P. M. in the student lounge at the Gettysburg Theological Seminary. Dr. C. A. Anderson led in the opening prayer. The minutes of the meeting of the Society held at Oberlin, Ohio, on April 22, 1950, were approved as printed in *Church History*, June 1950. The secretary reported the election of eleven new members. (See minutes of the Council).

The society discussed the revised draft of the constitution and matters relating to *Church History*. Dr. Robert Fortenbaugh described the tour of the battlefield and the trip to Conewago chapel scheduled for Saturday afternoon. The society voted an expression of appreciation to President A. R. Wentz, the Gettysburg Seminary and Dr. Fortenbaugh for arranging so adequately for this meeting. The session adjourned at 5:15 P. M.

At this meeting the following papers were read:

"Conflicting Ideas of Religious Freedom" by William W. Manross.

"Jonathan Edwards and Justification by Faith" by Thomas A. Shafer.

"The Mercersburg Theology" by George W. Richards.

"The Negro and the Church in Seventeenth Century Virginia" by Robert S. Cope.

"The Doctrine of the Church in Nineteenth Century Anglicanism" by Edward R. Hardy, Jr.

Attest: Raymond W. Albright,
Secretary

SURVEYS*

I. A SURVEY OF RECENT EASTERN ORTHODOX HISTORICAL LITERATURE

As interest in this field centers mostly in publications dealing with the Russian Orthodox Church, it is fortunate that the change in the Soviet religious policy has enabled that church to engage in a tiny amount of publication activity. Thus again it is possible to secure a minimal degree of information about the church-state relationship in the Soviet Union. The resumption of the publication program was initiated with the sumptuously printed collection of wartime official proclamations and appeals by Patriarch Sergius and other high church dignitaries in support of the war effort.¹ In these documents the Russian hierarchy expresses its loyalty to the Soviet regime in fulsome and servilely abject terms which bear eloquent testimony to the subservient rôle which the church plays in relation to the government.

Of far greater importance and interest is the book devoted to the term of office of Metropolitan, later Patriarch, Sergius (1926-1944) and to the beginnings of the administration of Patriarch Alexius (1945-).² This work affords a fairly full treatment of the life of the late Patriarch, as well as many documents relating to his administration. Especially important are the documents bearing upon the direct dealings between Sergius and Stalin, which resulted in the latter's permission for the holding of the Council for the election of Sergius to the patriarchal see. The section devoted to Alexius' administration is even more revealing of the use which the state is making of the Church—particularly of the hierarchy—for its own political purposes. This is done through the instrumentality of the commissariat for religious affairs headed by G. G. Karpov (whose functions irresistibly remind one of those of the tsarist High Procurators). As could be expected, there is no mention whatever of the persecuting and discriminatory measures formerly employed by the state for disintegration and destruction of religious life and the ecclesiastical institutions. On the contrary; many direct statements assert the most benevolent attitude of the government toward the Church, and its ceaseless care for its welfare. But unfortunately, the book does not present convincing proofs for the assertions.

A mention may be made in this connection of the official report dealing with the gorgeous and impressive celebrations of the five hundredth anniversary of the independence of the Russian Church

from the Patriarchate of Constantinople, held in Moscow in 1948. It was published in a monthly entitled *One Church*.³ This meeting was attended by the heads and representatives of most of the Orthodox churches, and partook thus (although unofficially) of the character of a Pan-Orthodox Congress. This meeting adopted, among other resolutions, also "An Appeal to the Christians of the World," in which it denounced in most resolute terms both Roman Catholic and Protestant communions (particularly those of the United States) as war-mongers bestowing "blessings upon a new war and hymns of praise to the atomic bomb. . . ."

But very different is the story told—presumably by an eye-witness—in *God's Underground*, a book the story of which was told by a "Father George," a Roman Catholic priest.⁴ It describes the religious destitution and hunger among the Russian Christians, and depicts the underground organization of those who refused to be lured by the new Soviet ecclesiastical policy. In the nature of the case, the author could not reveal the sources of his assertions and, unfortunately, the description of some of his alleged experiences raises a serious doubt as to its accuracy. But one wishes the story were true.

Besides these publications, there have appeared several welcome contributions to our knowledge of Russian church history, of which Serge Bolshakoff's *Russian Nonconformity* is the most recent.⁵ There has prevailed lack of accurate knowledge regarding the many religious groups of both the Old Believers and the sectarians, whose numbers, during the tsarist days, amounted perhaps to twenty-five millions and who even now comprise some ten millions. The book is packed with concrete information not available elsewhere in English. It supersedes the older works if for no other reason than that it carries the discussion to the present.

The second of these publications is edited by Metropolitan Seraphim of Germany and portrays various aspects of the history, as well as the liturgical and devotional life of Orthodoxy.⁶ A review of it has recently appeared in this quarterly, and therefore no further treatment is necessary.

Perhaps it would be well to remind the reader, in this connection, of the important works of Professor G. P. Fedotov, published some time ago. The first of these, *The Russian Religious Mind*,⁷ is the first volume of an extensive work dealing with the history of Russian spirituality. The next work edited by him, *A Treasury of Russian Spirituality*,⁸ is a real treasury of representative excerpts from the writings of Russian saints and masters of devotion.

Other works, dealing mainly with Russian religious thought, are as follows: Eugène Porret published a work⁹ the first part of which surveys the religious thought of the nineteenth century (Chaadaev,

Kireyevsky, Khomyakov, Leontev, and Solovev), while the second part is devoted to Berdyaev. Another philosopher's thought is made available in *A Solovyov Anthology*¹⁰ edited by S. L. Frank. Translations of Solovev's two hitherto untranslated works were made available recently; they were *The Meaning of Love*¹¹ and *Russia and the Universal Church*.¹²

The greatest amount of interest has been displayed in the thought of Nicolas Berdyaev who died in 1948. Three books were devoted to the exposition of his views, since the occasion invited a summary of his philosophy. George Seaver's treatment¹³ raises a suspicion that what his book expounds is George Seaver's, rather than Berdyaev's, thought. O. Fielding Clarke's *Introduction to Berdyaev*¹⁴ is a much more serious study. My own work¹⁵ has been reviewed in this quarterly by Dean Georges Florovsky, and therefore needs no further comment.

Furthermore, a contribution of first importance to Berdyaev literature is his own "spiritual autobiography," published posthumously both in Russian and English.¹⁶ Berdyaev students had been greatly handicapped by the scanty biographical data available to them prior to the publication of this work which for the first time throws light upon many puzzling and obscure aspects of his life and work. Accordingly, this work is indispensable for any serious study of Berdyaev. It is, for that reason, regrettable that the English translation is really a paraphrase of the original rather than a translation proper. Whole sentences and even paragraphs were omitted and insertions of translator's own comments were made without the slightest indication of the fact. The reader is not told, in the preface or otherwise, that the translator adopted this practice, or the reasons for it. Although the original is indeed written in a repetitious style, this is no excuse for changing the translation without a due notice of the fact.

Finally, attention should be called to two articles of interest to the church historian: one is by G. Luschnytsky, on "The Eastern Church Today";¹⁷ and the other by Marc Raeff, "An Early Theorist of Absolutism: Joseph Volokolamsk."¹⁸

The Hartford Seminary Foundation

Matthew Spinka

*It is planned to present in each issue of *Church History* at least two surveys of church-historical research. They are to be written by the members of the Editorial Board.

1 *Russkaya pravoslavnaya tserkov i velikaya otechestvennaya voina* (Moscow, 1943).

2 *Patriarkh Sergii i ego dukhovnoe nasledstvo* (Moscow, 1947).

3 *Yedinaya Tserkov-One Church*, II, 9-10 (New York, September-October, 1948).

4 Father George as told to Gretta Palmer, *God's Underground* (New York, c. 1949).

5 Serge Bolshakoff, *Russian Nonconformity* (Philadelphia, 1950).

6 Metropolit Seraphim, *Die Ostkirche* (Stuttgart, 1950).

7 G. P. Fedotov, *The Russian Religious Mind* (Cambridge, Mass., 1946).

8 G. P. Fedotov, *A Treasury of Russian Spirituality* (New York, 1948).

9 Eugène Porret, *La Philosophie Chrétienne en Russie; Nicolas Berdiaeff* (Neuchâtel, 1944).

10 S. L. Frank, ed., *A Solovyov Anthology* (New York, 1951).

- 11 V. S. Solovev, *The Meaning of Love* (New York, c. 1947).
- 12 V. S. Solovev, *Russia and the Church Universal* (London, 1948).
- 13 George Seaver, *Nicolas Berdyaev* (New York, 1950).
- 14 O. Fielding Clarke, *Introduction to Berdyaev* (London, 1950).
- 15 Matthew Spinka, *Nicolas Berdyaev: Captive of Freedom* (Philadelphia, 1950).
- 16 Nikolai Berdyaev, *Samopoznanie* (Paris, 1949); *Dream and Reality* (New York, 1951).
- 17 *Eastern Review*, L, 2 (Vienna, July-September, 1948).
- 18 *The American Slavic and East European Review* VIII, 2 (New York, April, 1949).

II. RESEARCH AND SOME RECENT PUBLICATIONS IN THE HISTORY OF MISSIONS

Research initiated by official missionary bodies is at present chiefly directed towards very practical ends and is concerned largely with principles, strategy, methods, and problems of administration, while historical studies still rank first in number in private research. However, several important missions in Europe and the United States have commissioned the preparation of scholarly and comprehensive histories.

The International Missionary Council is now engaged in "A Study of the Missionary Obligation of the Church." Although national councils around the world are participating in this study, it is primarily a re-thinking of the missionary obligation of the older, sending churches in the light of the present world situation, the prevalence of paganism at home, the maturity of the younger churches, and the rise of an oecumenical consciousness. The most important contributions to date have been in the fields of the Biblical and theological basis of the mission and missionary vocation. Some historical writing should appear in connection with this project. A conference will be held in Germany in July, 1952, and its report volume should constitute an important document of contemporary church history.

There are at present four notable study and publication projects in Protestant missions. The oldest project is the Missionary Research Series. This is under the general direction of the Department of Missions at the Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham, and the studies are published by the Lutterworth Press in London.

The books in this Series are chiefly in the fields of theology, philosophy, and the non-Christian religions. There are three which are of especial interest to historians. *The Transmission of the Faith* by Godfrey E. Phillips was published in 1948. It discusses the two dimensions in which the Christian faith must be transmitted: on the one hand, to non-Christians in evangelistic outreach, and, on the other, in the nurture of the youth within the fold. The experience of the Church in past ages is made to illumine the contemporary problem. The rise of numerous separatist sects in South Africa is a matter of major concern in an area where the Church is growing very rapidly. An excellent study of this development has been made

by Bengt G. M. Sundkler, now the professor of Church History and Missions at Uppsala. *Bantu Prophets in South Africa* was published in 1948.

The most extensive historical work as yet planned for the Series is *The Planting of Christianity in Africa*, in three volumes, by C. P. Groves. Only the first volume, published in 1949, has appeared. It covers the period to 1840. Historians of Missions have heretofore treated North Africa as part of the Near East and by "Africa" have designated the vast area south of the Sahara. Professor Groves now writes about the continent as a whole. There is little that is new in the sections on the early Church and Roman Catholic activities in the age of exploration, although they provide useful orientation. However, the beginnings of Protestant missions are traced in detail against a broad background of the rise of colonialism, cultural change, and the slave trade. The whole Protestant enterprise is kept in view, and adequate attention is given to the individual missions.

The second publication project is the Indian Research Series, sponsored and published by the Christian Literature Society at Madras. The Series is intended to meet the needs of Indian Christian academic and intellectual interests and to provide both Indian and missionary scholars with a vehicle of publication. The Series was first begun in 1949 and already six books have appeared and seven more are in press. The one historical work already published is *A History of the Mar Thoma Church and Its Doctrines* by K. K. Kuruvilla. This is the first history in English of the reformed branch of the ancient Syrian Jacobite Church of Travancore, and it includes a sketch of the early history of the Syrian Church in India and of Roman Catholic interference under Portuguese authority. A. Marcus Ward's *The Byzantine Church*, a Cambridge Hulsean Prize Essay, will soon appear.

There are two similar ventures in the Scandinavian countries. The Swedish Society for Missionary Research has sponsored two titles. One of them is a biography of the pioneer independent missionary to China, Gützlaff. It is by the lecturer in Missions at Lund, Herman Schlyter, and is written in German with a summary in English. Entitled *Karl Gützlaff als Missionar in China*, it was published in 1946 by Gleerup at Lund and Munksgaard at Copenhagen. The book is both scholarly and readable, and ranks high among recent missionary biographies. The Egede Instituttet in Oslo is rapidly becoming an important research center. It sponsors both scholarly studies and popular books for missionary education. Historical articles appear in its quarterly, *Norsk Tidsskrift for Misjon*.

There has been no comprehensive statistical study of Protestant missions since the *Interpretative Statistical Survey of the World Mission of the Christian Church* appeared in 1938 and no atlas since

the *World Missionary Atlas* of 1925. However, the World Dominion Movement in London has undertaken to produce such statistical studies and keep them up to date. In 1949 it brought out through its own press the first edition of a *World Christian Handbook*, edited by K. G. Grubb and E. J. Bingle. Half of the book is given to survey articles on the various countries and regions of the world. These are very uneven in quality, and some authors, especially the writer on China, read the signs of the times quite mistakenly; but the total picture of the World Church is of considerable value. The statistical section is limited to "Places of Worship," "Communicants or Full Members," "Total Christian Community," and "Staff"—ordained, laymen, and women, both foreign and national. Grand totals are not given. There is dispute concerning the apparently rapid rate of growth of the Christian community in many places in the periods between 1938 and 1949. This is chiefly due to the difficulty of attaining comparable figures for 1938. By "Christian Community" the Protestant community is indicated. The third portion of the handbook is a useful "Directory of Christian Churches and Missions." A second edition is now in preparation. The faults of the first edition will be corrected and the scope of the statistics will be enlarged.

The latest Roman Catholic atlas and statistics are two publications of the Propaganda: *Atlante delle Missioni Cattoliche Dipendenti della Sacra Congregazione de Propaganda Fide* (Rome, Luigi Salomone, 1947) and *Le Missioni Cattoliche Dipendenti della Sacra Congregazione de Propaganda Fide; Cenni Geografici e Storici Dati Statistici* (Rome, Propaganda, 1950.)

M. Searle Bates has made a thorough study of all available statistical data and brings together in brief compass much important information about the size and rate of growth of Protestant and Roman Catholic missions. He concludes that the two Christian communities in mission lands are approximately equal in numbers. His article is to be published in the *Shane Quarterly*, April, 1951, a periodical of the Butler University School of Religion at Indianapolis.

Three new Roman Catholic periodicals have begun publication within the last few years. The Société des Auxiliares des Missions at Louvain began in 1949 the publication of *Église Vivante*, a quarterly. *Rythmes du Monde*, another quarterly, published in Paris, first appeared in 1946. These periodicals cover the whole field of missiology, and from time to time contain articles of much interest to historians. The first issue of *Rythmes du Monde* in 1949, for example, is devoted to "Christians and Colonization." The *China Missionary* began publication at Shanghai in April, 1948, and was transferred to Hongkong with the name altered to *China Missionary Bulletin* in September 1949. A "Missions Chronicle" giving detailed news from the dioceses is one of its most valuable features. It is

monthly. The new central Missions Secretariat in Washington in cooperation with the Society for the Propagation of the Faith now publishes a quarterly entitled *Worldmission*. Volume I is for the year 1950. The *Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft* resumed publication again in Münster in 1947.

Two monumental histories of missionary societies have appeared in whole or part. *Det Norske Misjonsselskaps Historie I Hundre År* (Centenary History of the Norwegian Missionary Society), published at Stavanger by the Misjons-selskapets Forlag, is the work of a number of competent scholars, and represents a remarkable achievement carried through against great difficulties during war, occupation, and rehabilitation. Volumes 1 and 2 were published in 1943, Volumes 3 and 4 in 1949, and Volume 5 in 1948. The work has called forth something of a controversy over the original inspiration of Norwegian missionary interest by arguing for Moravian influence against that of the Pietist Hauge and his school. This history reveals that it was the missionary movement which transformed the Church of Norway from a piece of ecclesiastical machinery into a living *Volkskirche*.

The first two volumes of a six volume *History of Methodist Missions* by Wade Crawford Barclay have been published. They form Part I: *Early American Methodism, 1769-1844*. Volume 1 is entitled *Missionary Motivation and Expansion* (1949), and Volume 2, *To Reform the Nation*. The work is published by the Board of Missions and Church Extension of the Methodist Church, New York. These two volumes are largely an introduction to the actual development of a foreign mission which began with the appointment of Melville B. Cox to Liberia in 1833. It is the author's view that American Methodism is missionary by nature, that there is no sharp dividing line between home and foreign missions, and that missionary activity is so interwoven with the general history of the Methodist Church that no sharp line of division can be drawn. The first volume is concerned with the rise of Methodism and with the development of a sense of mission. The second volume deals with Methodism as an agency of moral and social reform which was an integral part of the missionary purpose of the Church. Dr. Barclay has done his work carefully. He brings together a vast store of information, well documented, and the work is a mine of bibliographical sources that will be useful to a wide range of scholars. Part II, also to be in two volumes, will be *Missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1845-1949*. Part III, in one volume, will be *Missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, 1845-1939*, and *Missions of the Methodist Protestant Church*. Part IV will be *World Outreach of the Methodist Church*. It will deal with the functional aspects of the missionary program such as evangelism and education.

There has long been need of a general history of German missions. In 1949 there appeared Wilhelm Oehler's *Geschichte der Deutschen Evangelischen Mission, Erster Band, Frühzeit und Blüte der Deutschen Evangelischen Mission, 1706-1885*. It was published at Baden-Baden by Wilhelm Fehrholtz. This is largely the story of the overseas enterprise and not of the home base activities of the societies, and it has the grave fault of treating German missions as developing in a vacuum. There is little reference to the work of missionaries from other lands. Despite its limitations the book is very useful because it is alone in its field. A useful guide to the missionary enterprise of the Scandinavian countries has been provided in *Nordisk Missionshistoria* (Scandinavian Missions History) by K. B. Westman, J. E. Lundahl, H. P. Madsen, E. Lehtonen, and H. Birkeli. Professor Westman provides a general historical introduction, and chapters follow on the missions of each of the four countries.

A first attempt at a complete regional survey of the South Pacific is a small volume *Pacific Conquest: The History of 150 Years of Missionary Progress in the South Pacific*, by Ian Shevill, Sydney, N.S.W., Pacific Christian Literature Society, 1950. Johannes Beckmann's book, *Die Katholische Kirche im Neuen Afrika* (Einsiedeln, Switzerland, Benziger, 1947), presents a total view of the Roman Catholic enterprise in Africa with respect to the missionary principles formulated by successive great leaders.

The Bishop of Viborg, Axel Malmstrom, has written a three volume general history of Missions, *Gospel til Alverden*, Copenhagen, Lohses, 1948-1950, highly acclaimed in Denmark. Basil Matthews' last book, published just at the time of his death, is a one volume history of a popular nature. *Forward Through the Ages*, published by Friendship Press, New York, in 1951, is a fascinating introduction to the history of missions for the uninitiated layman. It is filled with colorful but questionable generalizations and makes no pretensions to scholarship. *Light in Dark Ages* by V. R. Edman (Wheaton, Van Kampen, 1949) is an interpretation of the course of missions from the beginning to William Carey with emphasis upon obedience to the Dominical Command.

Some histories brought out in connection with commemorations are: *Let the People Read; A Short History of the United Society for Christian Literature*, by Gordon Hewitt (London, United Society for Christian Literature, 1949); *Glaubenskampf am Tigertor* (the Rheinische Mission in Kwangtung), by Wilhelm Kempgen (Wuppertal-Barmen, Rheinische Missionsgesellschaft, 1948); *Svenska Kyrkans Mission Sjuttiofem Ar* (75 years of the Church of Sweden Mission) (Uppsala, Svenska Kyrkans Missionsstyrelse, 1948); *The Catholic Story of Liberia*, by M. J. Bane (New York, D. X. McMullen, 1949); *Vijftig Jaren Zending 'Oegstgeest'* (Fifty years of the United

Societies of the Reformed Church of the Netherlands), by H. M. van Nes (The Hague, Voorhoeve, 1950); and *Mission Philafricaine en Angola*, 1897-1947, by Henri Monnier (Lausanne, Mission Philafricaine, 1947).

Protestant missionary periodical literature, missionary biography, and American missionary books of the last few years will be reviewed more fully in subsequent articles.

R. Pierce Beaver
Missionary Research Library

BOOK REVIEWS

By the Finger of God: Demon Possession and Exorcism in Early Christianity in the Light of Modern Views of Mental Illness. By S. VERNON McCASLAND. New York: Macmillan, 1950. xi, 146 pages. \$2.75.

This volume is an admirable example of the sort of definitive work that a real scholar can produce when he chooses to explore an important but neglected problem, gives it prolonged and mature investigation, canvasses his sources comprehensively, and reports honestly what his mind discovers. The reviewer recalls vividly how, twenty-five years ago, when the author was a graduate student, his mind was already zealously at work on the problem of this book. The Preface discloses that fifteen years ago, when the author was Annual Professor in the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem, the same problem was the theme for a seminar he conducted there. To the *Festschrift, Environmental Factors in Christian History*, published a few years later, he contributed a record of "Religious Healing in First-Century Palestine." Thus to the consideration of *Demon Possession and Exorcism in Early Christianity* S. V. McCasland brings the authority of decades of research and discussion and the thorough mastery of his materials.

Here are typical questions that receive full treatment in this volume. What different attitudes toward New Testament narratives of demon possession are possible for the modern student? As a matter of documentary record, in what strata of New Testament writings are such narratives found? What was the ancient explanation of these phenomena? How

would modern medical science analyze the cases of demon possession treated by Jesus? Do the stories of exorcisms by Jesus show indications of legendary development? Were they authentic reports of actual events, or were they creations of credulous imagination? Were exorcisms characteristic of Palestinian life in the time of Jesus? Did Jesus himself use the methods of exorcism current in his own time and milieu? If his methods were exceptional, what does this circumstance tell us about the personality of Jesus and his own self-consciousness? To quote in a single modest sentence the author's main conclusion: "The tradition about Jesus as an exorcist is trustworthy in its essential features and it has something to contribute to an understanding of his personality" (p. 139).

As this summary in question form distinctly intimates, the author of this volume expertly employs a variety of critical techniques in handling different phases of his main problem. Basically and consistently he is modern scientific in his point-of-view throughout. The cases discussed he analyzes as a present-day psychiatrist would treat them. He begins and ends with the question of the psychological authenticity of the exorcisms accredited to Jesus. Such are his literary sources, however, that he performs must be at once a documentary critic and a critic of tradition. With a full generation of oral transmission intervening between the events themselves and the earliest literary records of the events, both form criticism and documentary criticism are required to assess the literary authenticity of the records. Finally, and most expertly, the author shows

himself to be a dependable social historian. When it comes to the crucial question as to whether or not exorcisms were practiced in Jesus' own day among Jews in Palestine, McCasland marshals the environmental evidence involved with full decisiveness. In fact, one of the very noteworthy features of this study is the synthesis it presents of different critical techniques skilfully focused together for the resolution of a diversified problem-complex.

With regret a defect in the author's manner of presenting his materials must be noted, because it detracts somewhat from the conclusiveness of his work. He has a tendency to overstate his argument; to claim more for his case than the facts indicate. It is the debater's fault of exaggerating evidence on one side of an argument, and minimizing or ignoring evidence on the other side. Chapter V, where he discusses the question, "Are the Exorcisms of Jesus Folklore?" provides an example. At the outset he enumerates the three distinct possibilities involved: (1) They are authentic, eyewitness reports; (2) They are based on eyewitness reports, but they exhibit traditional modification and development; (3) They are outright creations of credulous popular imagination. In the following discussion, however, McCasland all but completely ignores possibility No. 2, and considers only the alternatives: eyewitness reports vs. imaginative creations. This oversimplified antithesis enables him to conclude that the Gospel accounts of exorcisms "belong in class with eyewitness reports rather than to the legendary creations of popular imagination" (p. 64). Most critical New Testament scholars would disagree with the author here. They would consider that possibility No. 2 describes much more nearly the character of this group of gospel stories. Indeed the very circumstance of the oral transmission of these materials through some four decades, would seem to require such characterization for them.

The author's Epilogue concludes

hopefully and ambitiously: "I hope that I may be able to make the Messiahship of Jesus the subject of another volume." The careful reader of the present volume, whether he agrees or disagrees with the conclusions here presented, will greatly hope that the author will be able to realize this ambition.

HAROLD R. WILLOUGHBY
The University of Chicago

Christianity and Pagan Culture in the Later Roman Empire. By M. L. W. LAISTNER. Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1951. 145 pages. \$2.50.

Professor Laistner has limited the broad topic of "Christianity and Pagan Culture" to the field of pagan and Christian education. Within these bounds the author has produced a remarkably clear and penetrating study of what happened to classical culture and Christian training in the later Roman Empire. The chapters comprise the James W. Richard Foundation lectures delivered at the University of Richmond late in 1950. To them has been appended the author's translation of Chrysostom's *Address on Vainglory and the Right Way for Parents to Bring Up Their Children*.

The book opens with an incisive analysis of the decline of pagan culture in general and of the stultification of classical learning in particular. The system of education of the later empire was essentially that of Athens in its hey-day, elementary school, high school and college. Higher education, reserved for the economically privileged, was dominated by the rhetors or sophists who received pupils already trained in literature and who guided them further into the mysteries of oratory, correct speech, and style. Written exercises were required throughout the course which lasted several years. What was the practical value of all this? In the author's words, "When he left the rhetor, the young man had a good knowledge of some at least of the great authors of the past; he had learned to express himself correctly and even elegantly

in both speech and writing; and concurrently he had been trained to exchange ideas and maintain an argument with his fellows Finally, it was the best preparation for a career in the imperial service, which afforded employment to a very large proportion of the educated class" (pp. 16, 17). The field of science, on the other hand, displayed no originality, but philosophers did criticize the sophists who also disputed among themselves. Yet even in philosophy, there was no intellectual advance save in Neoplatonism, which while uniting factors characteristic of several schools of philosophy sought also to combat that failure of nerve and eclecticism so deadening to Graeco-Roman morale.

We know little of early Christian instruction of the convert. Certainly parents were admonished to train their children properly, but at first the great majority of converts must have been adults, some of whom were probably illiterate, and all of whom probably memorized the Lord's Prayer and some confession of faith. To be sure Jerome wrote concerning education but he had in mind the ascetic life. Chrysostom's *On Vainglory and the Right Way for Parents to Bring Up Their Children* gives insight into the psychology of getting Biblical material across to the adolescent mind. Augustine's *On Catechising the Uninstructed* deals with those who sought to enter the lower catechumenate. Already by Tertullian's time the convert would have received instruction in basic Christian doctrine. Gregory of Nyssa's *The Great Catechism* was composed not for converts but for the catechists, who, however, had received classical education. So, too, the treatises by Tertullian and the *De Mysteriorum* by Ambrose were for the educated. Certainly what the Christian convert was taught was basically the same throughout the empire, though the method of instruction might differ according to cultural attainments.

How did classical education and Christian training get together? Al-

though the content of pagan literature was suspect and certainly not to be compared with scripture, the secular educational system could be used to aid a Christian philosopher to attack successfully pagan culture. But this culture was beneficial also to Christians and especially Christian teachers in providing a broad foundation for further Christian study, so that from the Apologists on increasing emphasis was placed upon the disciplines of classical education as the reports of Gregory Thaumaturgus upon Origen reveal. It would be a mistake, however, to imagine that this adjustment was limited either to Origen or to the Alexandrian school, for Christian writers East and West in the fourth and early fifth centuries generally appropriated pagan culture. Perhaps three outstanding Christian writers showed this influence, Ambrose (the *De officiis ministrorum*), Jerome (his *Letters* and his linguistic ability), and Augustine (principally the *De doctrina Christiana*).

Thus in three brief chapters the author covers a great deal of ground. More specialized than Cochrane's *Christianity and Classical Culture* or Pickman's *The Mind of Latin Christendom*, these lectures show the rapprochement of classical culture and Christian training in the later Roman Empire. This is good writing as well as sound scholarship, though at times the arrangement of the material leaves something to be desired. The addition of Chrysostom's treatise is by no means extra baggage but is a very real contribution to the main thesis. Able and scholarly notes in the back of the book also elucidate the text.

MERVIN M. DEEMS

Chicago Theological Seminary

John Cassian: A Study in Primitive Monasticism. By OWEN CHADWICK. Cambridge; At the University Press, 1950. xii; 213 pages.

John Cassian of Marseilles is memorable as 1) the ascetic theologian and organizer through whom Origenist-

Evagrian spirituality passed to Benedict of Nursia, 2) as the foremost of the anti-Augustinians in the Semi-Pelagian controversy, and 3) as the papally chosen clarifier of the Western position in respect to Nestorius. With each of these phases may be connected conveniently Cassian's three writings: 1) the *Institutes* composed at the request of the bishop of Apt (c. 425) after Cassian had succeeded in systematizing and adapting Egyptian asceticism in the two monasteries dedicated to St. Victor in Marseilles; 2) the *Conferences* (426-28) for the more advanced contemplative life, composed of reminiscences of the colloquies of the Egyptian fathers whom Cassian had visited from c. 386 until the outbreak of the Origenist controversy in 399 but interlarded with anti-Augustinian discussions of grace especially in xiii; and 3) *On the Incarnation* (430), dedicated to Pope Celestine and destined, despite its serious misapprehension of the position of Nestorius, to shape the Western conception of Nestorianism until modern times, interpreted as the Christological counterpart of the already condemned Pelagianism.

By a careful analysis of these writings and the allied documentary and modern monographic material, Chadwick has been able to assign with much greater clarity than heretofore the place of Cassian in the history of ascetic theory and practice. The work unfolds on another level from that of the excellent recent hagiography of Leon Cristani (*Cassien*, 2 vols. Abbay Saint-Wandrille, 1946). Unlike the latter who regards Cassian as Massilian or at least as a Provencal by birth, Chadwick favors a Scythian origin (Apx.B.). Chadwick is particularly valuable in defining the precise character of Evagrian piety and its derivation from Origenist intellectualism. Herein he draws upon recent studies by Walter Völker (*Das Vollkommenheitsideal des Origenes*, Tübingen, 1931), and S. Marsili (*Giovanni Cassiano ed Evagrio Pontico*, Studia Anselmiana, V, Rome, 1936.) He shows how Origen and

Evagrius continued and elaborated the originally Aristotelian distinction between the active and the contemplative *within* the ascetic life, which falls thus into two distinct phases. The active combat of the eight grosser sins (allegorically based on the seven hostile nations resisted by the Israelites in arriving at the Promised Land plus Egypt whence they set forth) is undertaken in the disciplined monastic community which prepares one for the still higher achievement of eventually wordless prayer in anchoritic solitude. Cassian perpetuated this conception of the superiority of the hermit over the monk in St. Victor. His *Institutes* is primarily designed for the lower slope, the *Conferences* for the highest reaches. Benedict's concentration upon monastic community, Chadwick remarks in passing, and his discountenancing of individualistic asceticism constitute the one really theoretically significant change Benedict wrought in his adaptation of Cassianic asceticism at Cassino. Chadwick has been clearly influenced by Anders Nygren's schematization of the agape and the eros motifs, and although he clears Cassian of the charge of semi-Pelagianism, our author does stress the loss of the Gospel sense of the divine agape as it bears upon the sustentation of the community life. Though he insists that H. B. Workman (*The Evolution of the Monastic Ideal*, London, 1913) went altogether too far in interpreting Eastern and Cassianic monasticism as the individualistic protest against the compromises of corporate Christianity in the world, Chadwick is at pains to show that the Eucharist was participated in by the monks and the hermits in Egypt and in Provence under Cassian's tutelage with only a vestigial sense of the Christian people as the Lord's Body, while monastic life was looked upon more as a form of mortification or tedious work than as the agape fellowship. Cassian had never asked himself the evangelical question posed first for ascetics by Basil: "If you always live alone, whose feet will you wash"? But on the purely indivi-

dualistic plane, Cassian still preserved Dominical injunctions and precepts. He understood that grace operated from within and that salvation rests upon the divine initiative. He challenged Augustine's denial of free will, holding instead that fallen man may occasionally, like the penitent thief, will to be saved and trust in the Lord, even though it is the Lord who perfects that salvation. At other times, indeed much more commonly, man is dependent upon God even for the will to faith. But Cassian's view of the soul as created at birth and inserted by God into each newborn child made it difficult for him to conceive of the individual's involvement in the sin of Adam in the radical sense of Augustine. Moreover, following the Evagrian line, Cassian thought of concupiscence as a challenge to the forces of the soul and the monastic combat occasioned by the temptations of the flesh as the way in which the soul could be disciplined and purified. Cassian even conjectured that perhaps the most effective use of God's grace was his withdrawal of it as the nurse fleetingly withholds her hand from the child learning to walk. But Cassian assumed that Christ was more than a pedagogue. To show this, Chadwick skillfully employs Cassian's *On the Incarnation*, which though it makes a caricature of Nestorianism, does give ample evidence that our representative ascetic theologian had indeed a fairly adequate Christology and comprehension of the divine initiative in the salvation of man. Pope Celestine's engagement of the abbot of Marseilles rather than the ailing bishop of Hippo as the formulator of the Western answer in the controversy affords us then, almost by chance, with the opportunity of examining the christological convictions of one whose primary interests were so centered in the description of and prescription for the minutiae of sinfulness that we might have falsely surmised that he and his fellow monastics relegated the Gospel to a quite secondary role in their lives.

Chadwick is able to correct by means of his monograph what he re-

gards as the imbalance in favor of disguised paganism in the interpretation of monasticism in the line running from Mosheim to Reitzenstein.

Chadwick's study is commendable in its scrupulous evaluation of the sources and the monographic literature, in the refinement of its ethical and theological distinctions, in brevity and clarity of exposition.

GEORGE HUNTSTON WILLIAMS
Harvard Divinity School

Five Centuries of Religion. Vol. IV: The Last Days of Medieval Monachism. By G. G. COULTON. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1950. 833 pages. \$9.00.

In this volume, prospected by the author in "The Last Generations of Mediaeval Monachism", *Speculum*, XVIII.4 (1943), 437-457, Dr. Coulton concludes his analysis of monasticism's noble assay: its struggle to enshrine renunciation and its steady engulfment by *Proprietas* and decay. He strives, here, "to display the full drama of successive reforms, as they were attempted by group after group in the hope of staving off the cataclysmic Reformation" (p. ix). The book, clearly handicapped in matter and form by dislocations of scholarship growing out of the last war, is, nonetheless, a fitting climax to a long career of astonishingly fruitful researches. As always, captious detractors and admiring critics alike elicit equally frank recognition. Both are given a wealth of new evidences to assess in evaluating the author's already well-buttressed convictions.

Dr. Coulton senses an old puzzlement still existing for certain readers after three volumes of exposition: How can the author contend, simultaneously, for the growing necessity of reform among the Religious and for their status as preeminent forces of European civilization? Professor Coulton has one last try at reconciling the apparent contradiction: "the monasteries (apart from exceptional times or places) were far from perfection, but the society which had bred them, and from which their influence was

derived, was itself still further from the Christian ideal" (p. 1).

The author writes for thoughtful business men and artisans with a flair for pondering on men and times other than their own, not only for scholars and teachers. Even so, he marshals primary documents, intensive and extensive, and balances judgments from many quarters and of many dispositions with such assiduity as to busy the most scholarly dissenter from the author's lively, often daring, but seldom inconsequential, generalizations.

One cannot even specify here the titles of the sixty-nine chapters. They range, with the usual Coultonesque interweaving of translated sources and critical opinion, through the life gamut of monks, nuns, canons, and friars. They hob-nob with Cistercians, Carthusians, Brethren of the Common Life, Franciscans and Dominicans. The itinerary of patent decadence and up-hill reform winds through every major area of Western Christendom. These studies investigate sporadic reforms and sustained attempts at spiritual revival; true monks and nuns as well as renegade Religious. Monastic rise and decay are related to the Northern as to the Southern Renaissance, to the Conciliar reforms of Constance and Basel, and to pre-Reformation stirring in England, France, and Italy.

Abbots in *commendam* are here more than feudal terminology. The minds and actions of monastic "visitors" are a revelation, as are those of the "visited." Bishops and popes who helped—and the ways in which they refused to help—reform are scrutinized within each specific milieu. Impunity, exemptions both wholesale and re-

tail, and the role of the secular arm are correlated with daily processes of spiritual renewal and stultification. Throughout every chapter there is the "Tug of War" between those who worked for reform and those who scotched it.

Nothing in the volume is more penetrating and absorbing than Professor Coulton's analysis of leading chroniclers and their accounts of reforms attempted by themselves or other hardy seekers after the crown of opprobrious reformation. Choice sections and critical evaluations throw into relief such battle grounds of the spirit as those of Johann Busch and his beloved Windesheim, Trithemius, and Hirsau, Ambrose (Traversari) and the Camaldoli, as well as Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa, the Dominican Nider, and their visitation work among "recalcitrant sisters."

The sermons of mendicant preachers, visitor's reports, "The Black Book," and literary-historical documents of the most diverse character help answer the query: *Quis Custodiet?* Moreover, they follow the trail of *Proprietas* up and down the whole monastic register.

Dr. Coulton's conclusions are well known already: Monasticism evidenced countless reform attempts by an unforgettable minority of dedicated renunciants. But the more they tried the less they prevailed upon the lax majority. Professor Coulton has had his say (having died in 1947). One doubts that the generations, with all their valid criticisms of this doughty, controversial scholar, will be able, fundamentally, to unsay it.

RAY C. PETRY

Duke Divinity School

